```
0001
 1
                   KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE
 2
                    REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
 3
 4
                         PUBLIC MEETING
 5
 6
 7
 8
                             VOLUME I
 9
10
11
                        Community Center
12
                        Cold Bay, Alaska
                        September 21, 2022
13
14
                            8:30 a.m.
15
16
17
18
    COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
19
20 Della Trumble, Chair
    Coral Chernoff
21
22
   Natasha Hayden
23
   Patrick Holmes
24
    Richard Koso
25
    Christopher Price
26
    Rebecca Skinner
27
28
29
30
    Regional
              Council Coordinator, Lisa Hutchinson-
31
    Scarbrough
32
33
34
35
36
37
    Recorded and transcribed by:
38
39
   Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
40
    329 F Street, Suite 222
    Anchorage, AK 99501
41
42
    907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

0002 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (Cold Bay, Alaska - 9/21/2022) 4 5 (On record) 6 7 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional 8 Advisory Council meeting. It's going to be a bit of a 9 10 test run because it's been a few years since we met in 11 person. So looking forward to this meeting and it's 12 nice to actually see faces, it's been a while. And to 13 be in Cold Bay and we just witnessed one of the most 14 beautiful sunrises in a while and that was a treat in 15 itself. So at this point we'll call the meeting to 16 order. 17 18 I just would like to make sure that 19 everybody knows that if you have public comments 20 they're welcome for each agenda items for regional concerns not included on the agenda. We appreciate 21 22 hearing your concerns and knowledge and there are forms 23 to fill out if you would like to testify. And the 24 Kodiak/Aleutians has always made it a practice that if you are available and would like to testify that we do 25 26 make that time and try to work with people. 27 28 And as many times the agenda is subject 29 to change so contact Lisa I think if you want something 30 on the agenda or would like to -- something to change. 31 32 So we'll call the meeting to order. 33 Before we start, Pat, if you can do the invocation, 34 please. 35 36 MS. HAYDEN: Della. 37 38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, go ahead. 39 40 MS. HAYDEN: Della, can you hear me? 41 42 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I can hear you. 43 Hello, can you hear us? 44 45 MS. HAYDEN: Not at -- not hardly at 46 all. Do you have a microphone that you're trying to 47 speak into? 48 49 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes. Can you

0003 hear now, Natasha? 2 3 MS. HAYDEN: Just a tiny bit better. 4 It's really just utterly faint. 5 6 That's the same with me, MR. KOSO: 7 Della, I can barely hear you on this here. 8 9 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. 10 the invocation since everybody's standing and then 11 maybe we'll try to figure out a better way to get this 12 to work. So let's go ahead and do the invocation. 13 14 MR. **HOLMES:** Yes, Madame Chair. 15 Usually at this point I bring up a carving I did on yellow cedar of Liam Sua who is an ultimate omniscient 16 17 deity of the Alutiiq people. And just to have folks 18 focus on that and bear in mind that our duty here is to 19 the folks that live in our region to provide -- make 20 sure that they are able to have adequate food and 21 maintain their cultures. 22 23 with that little And so 24 announcement we'll all join together in the Lord's 25 Prayer. 26 27 (Invocation) 28 29 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. 30 Just a question besides Natasha and Rick can anyone 31 let us know how you're hearing us on the 32 conference call? 33 34 MR. POLUM: Hey, Della, this is Tyler 35 at Fish and Game in Kodiak and it's very quiet for all 36 of us here too. We can just barely hear you. 37 38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I'm going 39 to have the recorder and we'll see what we can figure out here. So kind of break here for a little while and 40 41 maybe figure out a solution. 42 43 (Off record) 44 45 (On record) 46 47 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We'll call the 48 meeting back to order. We will continue though if we can get a speaker phone just in case you run into a 49

```
0004
    problem again with that, we have that capability,
 2
    conference phone.
 3
 4
                    So again we'll call the meeting back to
 5
    order. We did the invocation, we'd like to welcome
 6
    everybody to the Kodiak/Aleutian meeting and it's the
 7
    first time we've met person to person in quite a --
    couple of years actually and it's nice to actually put
    faces to names. So we will do a roll call to establish
 9
10
    a quorum.
11
12
                    Lisa.
13
14
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Thank you,
15
   Madame Chair.
16
17
                    Patrick Holmes.
18
19
                    MR. HOLMES: Here.
20
21
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Richard
22
   Koso.
23
24
                   MR. KOSO: I'm here.
25
26
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Sam Rohrer.
27
28
                    (No comments)
29
30
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Christopher
31
   Price.
32
                   MR. PRICE: Here.
33
34
35
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Coral
36
   Chernoff.
37
38
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Here.
39
40
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Rebecca
41
    Skinner.
42
43
                    MS. SKINNER: Here.
44
45
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Della
46
    Trumble.
47
48
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Here.
49
```

```
0005
 1
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Natasha
 2
    Hayden.
 3
 4
                    MS. HAYDEN: Here.
 5
 6
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
 7
    Madame Chair, there's six out of seven sitting members
 8
    available so we have a quorum.
 9
10
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.
11
    this time -- we've pretty much done the welcome and we
12
    will do the introductions.
13
14
                    So, Coral, I think if we start on your
15
    side we'll do the Council and then we'll do members of
    the -- that are sitting in the room and then I will
16
17
    call online for names by agencies or as we go through
18
    the process.
19
20
                    So, Coral, would you like to get
21
    started, please.
22
23
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Good morning, everyone.
24
    My name is Coral Chernoff and I am a representative
25
    from Kodiak region.
26
27
                    MS. SKINNER: Good morning.
28
    Skinner, RAC member from the Kodiak region.
29
30
                    MS.
                         HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                      Good
31
               This is Lisa Hutchinson-Scarbrough. I'm the
    morning.
32
    Council Coordinator.
33
34
                   MR. PRICE: Good morning. Chris Price
35
    from Unalaska. I'm the Unalaska representative on the
36
    KRAC.
37
38
                    MR. HOLMES: Pat Holmes from Kodiak. I
39
    guess I'm the token geezer and pretty much worked and
    lived almost everyplace from Douglas -- Cape Douglas to
40
41
    Attu and Pribilofs and feeling real privileged to have
42
    worked out on the Peninsula and the Aleutians a fair
43
    amount of my past time. And I think this is such an
    important role for us as representatives
44
                                                   of our
45
    community and of our region to try to find the most
46
    equitable way for folks to get their food.
47
48
                    Thank you, Madame Chair.
```

```
0006
 1
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           Thank you, Pat.
 2
    Rick and Natasha.
 3
 4
                    MR. KOSO:
                                Yeah, Rick Koso.
                                                 Ι
 5
    from Adak and been in Sea Cove, Cold Bay, fished out of
 6
    both places and the Aleutian Islands, but I represent
 7
    Adak right now.
 8
 9
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick.
10
    Natasha.
11
12
                    MS. HAYDEN: Hi, good morning. Natasha
13
    Hayden.
              I am born and raised in Kodiak, lived in the
14
    Kodiak region most of my life.
15
16
                    Thank you.
17
18
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.
                                                       And
19
    we'll go ahead and start in the room.
20
21
                    Glenn.
22
23
                    MR. CHEN:
                                  Aloha, Madame Chair and
    Council members. My name is Glenn Chen, I'm the
24
    Subsistence Branch Chief for the Bureau of Indian
25
26
    Affairs. Always a pleasure to attend your meetings and
27
    to see all of you in person.
28
29
                    Thank you.
30
31
                    MR. KOLLER:
                                  Good morning, members of
32
    the Council, Madame Chair.
                                 My name is Justin Koller.
33
     I'm a Fish Biologist with the Office of Subsistence
34
    Management.
35
36
                    MR. STONE: Good morning, Madame Chair,
37
    members of the Council. My name is Jarred Stone. I'm
38
     a Fisheries Biologist with the Office of Subsistence
39
    Management.
40
41
                    MS. WESSELS:
                                    Good morning,
                                                    Madame
42
    Chair, members of the Council.
                                         My name is Katya
43
    Wessels and I'm the Council Coordination Division
44
     Supervisor with OSM. I'm happy to welcome you here in
    person and I'm happy that we're able to keep all the
45
46
     2022 Council meeting cycle with meeting in person.
47
```

Thank you.

49 50

MR. AYERS: Good morning, Madame Chair and members of the Council. This is Scott Ayers. I'm the OSM Fisheries Division Supervisor. I too am pleased to see everyone in person. It's wonderful to be back to Cold Bay and I hope we have a productive meeting today.

Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Good morning, Madame Chair, members of the Council. I'm Jason Roberts, Anthropologist with OSM.

MS. FOSADO: Good morning, Madame Chair, members of the Council. Welcome to Cold Bay, we're excited to have you here. I'm Maria Fosado and I'm the Izembek Refuge Manager.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning, Madame Chair and members of the Council. My name is Alison Williams and I'm a Wildlife Biologist for Izembek Refuge.

MR. LAWSON: Good morning, Madame Chair, members of the Council. My name is Tyler Lawson with the Department of Fish and Game and I'm the Assistant Area Management Biologist based here in Cold Bay.

MR. KEYSE: Hi. Good morning, Madame Chair. My name is Matt Keyse. I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Assistant Area Management Biologist based out of Sand Point.

MS. MELENDEZ: Good morning, Madame Chair and the RAC Council members. Welcome back to Cold Bay, I'm glad to see you all in person. And hello and good morning to all those who are in attendance.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, everyone. Leticia. Yeah, this is the City of Cold Bay.

 And I have to say something before we start online. Maria, I for some reason and this is how out of touch we've been with this covid thing and not seeing people face to face, but for some reason I thought you were a lot older than you are.

0008	(Laughter)
3 4 5	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm telling you all that when you said your name I'm like oh, my god, I feel silly.
7 8 9	All right. We'll go online. For those of you online we'll start with Fish and Wildlife Staff.
10 11 12 13	MS. KLEIN: Good morning. This is Jill Klein. I'm the Regional Subsistence Coordinator for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service based out of the Anchorage regional office.
15 16 17 18	MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning. This is Jeff Williams, Deputy Refuge Manager for the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. Good morning, everyone.
20 21 22 23 24	MR. GERKEN: Good morning. This is John Gerken with the Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm the Federal In-Season Manager for Bristol Bay, the Aleutians and Chignik. Good morning.
25 26 27 28	MS. HOLMAN: Good morning. This is Kendra Holman, Wildlife Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.
29 30 31 32	MR. PAPPAS: Good morning. George Pappas, Office of Subsistence Management, State Subsistence Liaison.
33 34 35 36	MR. VICKERS: Good morning. This is Brent Vickers, Office of Subsistence Management, Supervisor for the Anthropology Division.
37 38	Thank you.
39 40 41 42 43	MS. LaVINE: Good morning. This is Robbin LaVine, Subsistence Policy Coordinator with the Office of Subsistence Management. Good to hear you all. Sorry we can't there all of us can't be there in person.
45 46 47	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Let's continue on to ADF&G Staff, the State.
48 49 50	$$\operatorname{MR.}$$ BURCH: This is Mark Burch with the Department of Fish and Game in Palmer.

```
0009
 1
                    MR. DUNKER:
                                    Good morning, Madame
    Chair, members of the Council. My name's Bill Dunker,
 2
    I'm calling in from the Kodiak Fish and Game office
    with the Division of Wildlife Conservation.
 4
 5
 6
                    Thank you.
 7
 8
                    MS. KEATING:
                                      I'm Jackie Keating,
 9
    Division of Subsistence in Anchorage.
10
11
                    MS. KRUEGER:
                                   Good morning.
12
    Kelly Krueger and Mark Lavine with Fish and Game Sport
13
    Fish in Kodiak.
14
15
                    MR. POLUM:
                                   Good morning.
16
    Tyler Polum with Fish and Game Sport Fish in Kodiak as
17
    well.
18
19
                    MS. KLOCK: Good morning, Madame Chair.
20
           is Susan Klock.
                                I'm the Commercial and
     Subsistence Fisheries Manager for the South Alaska
21
    Peninsula and Aleutian Islands.
22
23
24
                    MR. WILCOX:
                                     Good morning, Madame
25
    Chair.
             This is Chance Wilcox with the Division of
26
    Subsistence in Anchorage.
27
28
                    MR. WADLE: Good morning, Madame Chair.
29
    This is Jeff Wadle, Regional Management Biologist for
30
    Western Region, Fish and Game.
31
32
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: If we could stop
33
    for a second. The person before Jeff, can you restate
34
    your name, please.
35
36
                    MR. WILCOX:
                                    Yeah, sorry.
                                                    This is
37
    Chance Wilcox with the Division of Subsistence in
38
    Anchorage.
39
40
                         JACKSON:
                                     Good morning, Madame
41
    Chair.
             This is James Jackson, Kodiak Commercial and
42
     Subsistence Area Management Biologist.
43
44
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                             Okay.
                                                    I think
45
    we've saved the most important for last. Do we have
46
    people from the communities that represent.
47
48
                    Vince, I did hear you online.
```

```
0010
 1
                    MR.
                          TUTIAKOFF:
                                          This
                                                is Vince
    Tutiakoff. I won't be with you the whole day, but
 2
    will be -- I would like to be able to testify possibly
    tomorrow in regards to the subsistence issues that
    we're dealing with here in Unalaska.
 5
 6
 7
                    Thank you very much and have a great
 8
    meeting.
 9
10
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                               Thank you,
11
    Vince. We'll make sure that we get you online.
12
13
                    Anybody
                               else
                                       online
                                                from
                                                       the
14
    communities?
15
16
                    MR. VAN DAELE: Good morning.
17
    Matt Van Daele with Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak.
18
19
                    MS. PETERSON: Good morning, Madame
20
    Chair and Council members.
                                   This is Amy Peterson,
    Koniag Community Affairs Liaison.
21
22
23
                    MR. SMITH:
                                Good morning.
24
    Daniel Smith, Tribal Biologist with the Sun'aq Tribe of
25
    Kodiak.
26
27
                    MS. JONES: Good morning, Madame Chair
28
    and members of the Council.
                                  This is Tami Jones with
29
    the Native Village of Ouzinkie.
30
31
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           Okay. Is there
32
     anybody else online that we may have missed?
33
34
                    MS. JOCHUM: Good morning, Madame Chair
35
    and members of the Council. This is Kim Jochum, I'm
    with the National Park Service, Regional Subsistence
36
37
    Program and ISC member.
38
39
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm sorry, can
40
     you repeat that, please?
41
42
                    MS. JOCHUM: Good morning. I can speak
43
     up a little bit. My name is Kim Jochum, I'm with the
    National Park Service, Regional Subsistence Program and
44
45
     an ISC member. Looking forward to this meeting.
46
47
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                               Thank you.
48
    Anyone else online?
```

0011 1 (No comments) 2 3 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. 4 none, good morning and welcome, everyone. Thank you 5 for being patient. We had a little bit of -- some 6 complications getting started here. 7 8 So I'll move on to review and adopt 9 agenda. 10 11 HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: MS. 12 Chair, I would like to note that what is in the Council 13 books, we've amended the agenda. The agenda has been 14 posted -- the updated agenda has been posted online and 15 is available here in the room. If you would like that 16 the -- the changes that were made were on items -under item 11B, the Federal proposals and Federal 17 closure reviews. What we did is we moved the first two 18 19 items down to the -- in a different sequence so FP 23-20 06a and FCR 23-15 and FP 23-06b and FCR 21-16 were just 21 moved down to the 8 and 9 on the agenda. 22 23 In addition we added under 11 -- added 24 under 11I, we just want to have an announcement for the 25 Board of Fisheries meeting that is coming up and we'd 26 like to add -- Coral had indicated that she would like 27 to have a couple of the proposals added to the 28 discussion. 29 30 Coral, would you like to discuss the 31 items you wanted added, please. 32 I thought that 33 MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. 34 since we were in Cold Bay and these were in reference to Cold Bay maybe we could bring up Proposal 98 and I 36 think that was submitted by Fish and Game and Proposal 37 103, submitted by Candace Nielson. 38 39 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: 40 We'll add that to the agenda. And then under the agency reports under the Alaska Department of Fish and 41 42 Game there was one other report presentation that will 43 be under the Kodiak Area Wildlife Conservation Office 44 with Bill Dunker. 45 46 Madame Chair, that's the only changes 47 to the agenda. 48

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Pat

49

```
0012
    Holmes, did you have an item that you wanted added?
 2
 3
                    MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I made some
 4
    notes of things that hadn't shown up in our -- we
    talked about in our prior -- previous meeting in
 5
    relation to the various closure reviews and a lot of
 6
 7
    them on Unalaska and our Coordinator will be making a
    copy of that so it makes it in the record.
                                                    We've
    talked about those items on this list before, but they
 9
10
    never made the minutes. So I think it would be good to
11
    get those in the minutes. And so when we get them
    copied everybody will get a copy of those particular
12
            that might need to have a little more
13
    points
14
    elaboration or discussion.
15
16
                    Thank you.
17
18
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
19
    Maybe we can add those poss -- yeah, on the review and
20
    approve previous minutes, Pat's list.
21
22
                    Any other items?
23
24
                    (No comments)
25
26
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: If not, do we
27
    have a -- hear a motion to approve the agenda as
28
    amended.
29
30
                    MS. SKINNER: This is Rebecca Skinner.
31
    I'll move to approve the agenda as amended.
32
33
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there a
34
    second.
35
36
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Second.
37
38
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second by Coral.
39
    All right. Discussion.
40
41
                    (No comments)
42
43
                    MADAME
                            CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                               Call for
44
    question. All in favor signify by saying aye.
45
46
                    IN UNISON: Aye.
47
48
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Opposed same
49
    sign.
50
```

0013 1 (No opposing votes) 2 3 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Moving on. 4 will now move on to Council member reports. And maybe we'll go ahead and start with you, Pat, on your side of 5 6 the table. 7 8 MR. HOLMES: Me. Yeah, I need to have 9 Chris give me a poke because I had some serious surgery 10 on my ears in May and it kind of knocked my socks off 11 for a couple of months. And so my hearing is not that good and so if people hear me -- my phone beeping or 12 13 talking to me and I don't respond, I just flat didn't 14 hear you. 15 16 But that physical thing kind of messed 17 up my whole subsistence season. I did get out and do 18 some tide pooling and got some sea urchins. 19 berries around our house, the salmonberries were good, 20 but the ones that were in the direct wind were pretty well short on berries. And we went up to look for 21 22 lingonberries and they seemed to be kind of sparse up 23 on Pillar Mountain. And that seems in my mind to happen when we have a real dry July every 10 years is 24 25 that the berries don't seem to be quite as productive. 26 27 The Buskin River was closed quite early for a weak run, it didn't open until late in the season 28 29 and folks that I know that went out later in the season 30 had trouble with the sea lions and seals. And folks I talked to that went deer hunting got some nice deer, 31 32 but -- last fall, but they're still in the recovery 33 phase. 34 35 So that's my report, Madame Chair. 36 Thank you. 37 38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. 39 Chris. 40 41 MR. KOSO: Did you call on me, Della. 42 43 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead. You 44 can go ahead, Rick. Go ahead. 45 46 MR. KOSO: I'm not hearing too good on

this phone here, you're still kind of -- kind of quiet

and Adak so far subsistence wise is doing fairly well.

So anyway I'm from Adak there

47

48

49

50

once in a while there.

I mean, we had the meeting a while back on the caribou with — we had quite a few Committee people attend and some of the guides were in attendance. So the caribou itself is thriving fairly well, I don't see any problem as far as extinction of the caribou unless they go out and get some sort of an influx of people that come in and just kill them off. But right now we're sitting fairly well in Adak. I know that the Feds don't have the money or the staffing to do a survey. I was hoping we could get that done. But anyway overall Adak is doing — is doing pretty well. I know the ptarmigan is kind of in a bad situation there, but a lot of the guides are not shooting them and stuff and they elected to stand down on that. So that was great.

But overall most of the people are together in Adak and I think Adak is doing really well as far as subsistence goes. But we still have to watch the caribou herd real well, real good because I think the Feds would like to see us down to 150 population on our island to me which is crazy because that -- you know, for food and essential need for the community would be devastated if that was the case.

So anyway that's all I had. Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick. Natasha, do you want to go ahead.

MS. HAYDEN: Sure. Good morning. Thanks. I don't have a lot different to report other than what Pat already stated. The Buskin was closed. I was able to get some subsistence sockeye from the Pasagshak, in July I got a few. When I was out there I didn't see a lot of gillnetters, the -- I think I was out there two or three times. And I think that they got the escapement that they were looking for, but it wasn't -- I don't think there was a lot of surplus. don't know how many fish were taken rod and reel and it also look like there were a huge number of sport fishers out there at that time. I think the return over at Port Lions was really good or adequate.

Similarly with the deer I've heard a couple people who have taken bucks here and there so far after August 1st just started, but hadn't seen a huge amount of them. But I agree that it does seem like they're still in the rebound phase, but better than last year for sure.

I think there was a lot of blueberries. It seemed to me they were riper a lot earlier than normal, like I would still be going out and getting berries that are just getting to seeming to be ripe about this time of the year, closer to the end of September and the leaves are already falling, it does seem early to me. And also with the lingonberries, I haven't started my lingonberry hunt yet in earnest, but I did see a few up on Pillar and the salmonberries as well. It's interesting about the salmonberries because I did see and maybe somebody else knows what the cause of this is, but there was a lot of dead salmonberry branches from -- even from the beginning of the season when the salmonberries started to bloom, it seemed like there was a lot of dead stalks sticking up above the ones that were leafing up and putting out blossoms.

Let's see. Well, I think that's it for me for now. I'm looking forward to hearing some of the reports on the bird populations and harvests.

Thank you, Della.

 $\label{eq:MADAME} \mbox{MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:} \qquad \mbox{Thank you,} \\ \mbox{Natasha. Chris.}$

MR. PRICE: Hi. Good morning. Thank you, Della. Again it's a real honor to be a part of this process and working in partnership with the communities that we have is a important part of what we do so I look forward to these meetings this week and working on these issues that we've been given to take a look at here representing our communities.

 As far as subsistence goes in the communities in Unalaska this summer we did have a successful start up on the McLees Lake getting the weir set up. And again that's why I bring up the partnerships, we needed a lot of help this year getting mobilized and we had Tyler with Fish and Game was a big part of that, Kenesha, Jenny and Emily. And then we had OC, the village corporation and OCCP, our power generation company helped to provide a landing craft for us to help us get supplies and materials out there at the beginning of the season which was a -- weather wasn't great and we needed a bigger boat.

 $$\operatorname{But}$ as far as the fishing this summer weather wasn't great and at the beginning of the season

we didn't have much fish to catch. So the season -you know, we just didn't have any fish showing up until
almost mid July. And once the fish started showing up
we did have some people get out there, but we lost some
nets, we had some boats get swamped and it's a -- it
can be a very dangerous place if you're not aware of
what you're doing out there. So we got through that,
but for the most part we struggled to get enough food
for the local community, for the elders and for the
tribal members. So we ended up buying fish boxes from
Chignik this year for all our tribal member households.
So we're fortunate we were able to get those fish boxes
sent down and they got out to the community.

I just didn't hear a lot of great things as far as people getting a chance to fish this year. Vince will be on the line, he can -- he'll be very in tune with what was able -- you know, what happened in that regard. There's -- some fish were caught, but in general, you know, our local economy, we're very concerned about the reductions in the king crab and the opilio crab fisheries. We're concerned about the general ocean conditions in the Bering Sea, we're concerned about how that's going to affect commercial fisheries in our community.

And on the Front Beach as far as subsistence goes, you know, we've got some families that traditionally fish on the Front Beach and they hit and miss. Some people seem to be taking more than their fair share. And I think we might want to look at additional reductions on the catch levels until Unalaska Lake and the Iliuliuk River start to recover as far as the red salmon are concerned. We are seeing some concerns with the return of the red salmon in Unalaska Lake.

And so I'll leave it at that. Thank you guys for having this meeting. Appreciate it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Chris. Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Thank you. So there have already been several reports from Kodiak and I won't repeat all of that information. I think at a high level in Kodiak which I realize is one of the bigger communities in this region, but I've noticed at -- when I go to the grocery store we've definitely had less

stuff in the grocery store, depending on when the ship comes in and then when the barge does come in we still don't have a lot of the store which is really I think emphasize the importance of food security and the ability to harvest the local resources through subsistence.

I also just got an email notice that there's a coho closure that starts tomorrow at Buskin. So for -- you've already heard about salmon was not great in Kodiak, we had sockeye closure early in the year, we have a coho closure now. And it just drives homes the concern about food security. And so when we're sitting at this table I know we're all very focused on ensuring that people in our communities and our region have access to food and to subsistence resources.

From a commercial fishing perspective which impacts our communities it's also a source of some of the subsistence food that we eat. So if you take home pack home from your commercial fishing it has an impact. So I wanted to comment that from a salmon perspective this year I think Prince William Sound was not great. I've already spoken to Kodiak I think was not great and Bristol Bay had a banner year. And I think previously I've spoken about the cod stock being down, that seems to be improving somewhat. And then we heard Chris speak about the crab fishery closure that's having a huge impact out in Unalaska.

So all of that is -- really points to the importance of the changing ocean conditions and how that's impacting the stocks, the access to subsistence foods and then also what's happening with the commercial fisheries. And all the communities in our region or a lot of them have a very strong connection to commercial fishery so when the commercial fisheries are down it really does impact the community.

And then other than that in Kodiak we had some warm weather early on at the beginning of the summer, but primarily it seemed like it was a cold, rainy summer. But I think that's because that happened most recently.

That's all I had. Thanks.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,

1 Rebecca. Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Good morning. Yeah, I'll just mention probably everything other people have mentioned for the Kodiak area. The weather was actually really warm for me in June. In June we set four records for high temperatures for the day so that's quite amazing. Usually we -- I mean, we can go years without setting a new high temperature. think that probably had a lot of effect on our plants. I noticed the salmonberry crops, like they just started our really big, really huge, I could put four of them in my hand and then they just went away. And I also noticed like Natasha did just a lot of like dead looking plants and sticks. So while we usually have kind of a long crop of salmonberries we had a very -in my experience and when I was out there, just a really short, early burst of salmonberries.

As they talked about Buskin River closed fairly early, but it also reopened again fairly early. It seemed like we had -- the fish were very slow coming in and then right before it reopened on July 2nd, like on the 29th, escapement was like 4,500 or something like that. And I had been out there at one time and it was like escapement for the day or going past the weir was like zero and zero and zero for like six or seven days. So they just came in in kind of a big burst. So it's just been a weird salmon year.

 Recently I went to the other side of the Island to get silvers, I went -- I figured 20 silvers, no big deal. I got zero and the reports were that commercial fishing was shut -- shutting down on the other side of the Island, silver salmon were coming in small. And there hadn't been any, we went to two rivers and there was no silvers up the one river. And then there were a few up the other. Clients for -- fishing clients coming from out of state are not limiting out from what I've been hearing from four lodges out on the other side of -- western side of the Island. Pretty slow.

As for other crops, I do a lot of -- I do plant gathering. It seemed like other plants were just phenomenal. We have -- we've been around fireweed that's like eight feet tall, like seemed just extra tall this year. The nettles, I was out on the other side of the Island, the nettles are just -- I've never

seen them like just so thick together and tall. So the nettles are doing good. I've seen plantain which I normally see, you know, leaf size, like smaller than my hand, I've seen plantain leaves like this big, they're like -- everything looks like prehistoric large. So whatever the weather was doing I think it was great for a lot of the plants. The highbush cranberries seem to be doing really well right now.

Crayfish in the Buskin. This year people were going out and gathering and kind of, you know, trying to help to get rid of some of the crayfish, but that was stopped this year so people can no longer take crayfish out of the Buskin. And so hopefully here -- we'll hear -- we haven't heard in a couple years from Sun'aq about their studies that they did to see what the crayfish are eating, so hopefully we'll hear from them this year or next year about what's happening there.

For crab, we have crab pots in the water and fish a lot of crab. Crab seem to be pretty scarce this year. Mostly we get opilios. The last two years with some iffy situations down in -- with the crab, commercial fishing down in Oregon's been kind of weird and off and on. We have a lot of pressure from fishermen coming up and so we've had thousands of more dungeness pots put into our waters around Kodiak and I think when we go out to subsist for crab that really shows. We haven't got a king crab in our pot in five or six years. And this year I think we caught maybe one or two dungeness and mostly opilios -- I mean tanners. So it seems like the commercial fisheries for crab are putting a lot of pressure on our crab stocks.

So I am the representative for Kodiak for the AMBCC for our region. We've got a State We had a management plan for meeting coming up. emperor geese and that has expired. So for the last six months we started working on the new management plan for both sport and -- well, we talk about sport and subsistence together. So we're working on that now, I think we're expecting that to take about a year. In our management plan -- so in our management plan we have a harvest strategy and we've made three ranges. So every year we check the population -- we look at the population surveys and that's how we decide what harvest is going to be. So last year -- no, last year there was no harvest survey. The year before I think

it was down and so we were in a restrictive phase. when it's in the green we are open to harvest a thousand -- a thousand birds throughout the State. And then so we just kind of decided and divided up the State so the Aleutians we've given them more because, 5 you know, there's more birds in the fall through Kodiak 6 7 and the Aleutians than there are up north. So during good population times we have a harvest of a thousand. 9 When it's -- when the population goes down which it did 10 a couple years ago then we went into kind of a 11 restrictive stage and we've reduced that hunt to 500 12 birds. And then the YKDelta voted to not have an egg 13 take so there was no egg take and birds were restricted 14 during the fall hunt to 500. This year the population 15 status was up again so we're up into the green and we're talking right now in our upcoming meeting about 16 17 because the population is sort of right on that line of 18 sort of, you know, going in and out of the ranges we're 19 talking about just what we're going to do this year. 20 Our emperors seem to be healthy populations coming in 21 for the fall, they're coming in on time.

2223

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

And then lastly in the Kodiak area I'll just talk about we've had our road system -- we had a road system hunt close so you had to be 500 feet offshore in order to hunt for the springtime. So two years ago we just -- we got -- no, last year, this was out second year, we had a road system hunt open. So you have to get a permit, we wanted to track harvest so we're in a -- we have a three year plan where we -- the harvesters have to come in and get a permit and then they have to report their harvest. We've had roughly plus or minus 40 people get permits for the spring hunt, not a lot of birds have been taken. And emperors are close on the road system, the terns are closed on the road systems and they said because mews, mew gulls hang out next to the emperors those were also closed. So no egging or birding for mew, tern and emperors. So that's gone well and we haven't had the immense pressure that was feared I think. So next year we'll look at getting rid of that permitting system. We kind of put it in place so we could track what was happening.

43 44

42

And I think that's all I have. Thank 46 you.

47 48

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Coral. So I'll go ahead and do my report. I think the

fish it seemed like June may have been fairly decent for everybody, but July and August seemed really slow. The silvers were definitely not there like they were last year. It's kind of interesting to see.

Berry wise I think we've fortunately with the salmonberries, there were a lot of salmonberries, but with the rain and they didn't last long, but there were a lot of salmonberries. And some people are getting blueberries now and of course the mossberries, but not so much as -- I think the mossberries is in the past.

Crab has definitely had an impact as Chris said on our communities not having the crab seasons and it's definitely had a big impact on our communities and hopefully that rights itself out sooner than later.

Bird populations, I haven't really been tracking any of this. I'm kind of interested to see what these reports are when we look at Izembek and what's moving, coming in and what you guys have observed.

I think as Rebecca stated clearly the impact on the various species and the temperatures warming and what that means for communities and the importance of subsistence I think is really clear. And I think you probably will hear that Statewide anymore and what that means for all of us. And we look recently with the big storms up at north and the impacts that will have on the various streams and in the near future is something I think we should closely watch also. But it is a big concern, there's a lot happening and what that means to us and how we adjust and go forward is going to be -- it's going to take a lot of effort on all of parts Statewide to try to work together to figure this out and not work against each other. That's going to be the tough part of it all.

But with that I think that's basically all I have for my report right now.

Oh, and then I'll just add, I know I did talk to someone from Sand Point yesterday and he did say that his salmon season wasn't good at all. So, yeah. It's interesting -- it'll be interesting to hear what Lisa's report will have to say.

I'll go ahead and move on to my Chair's report. I did attend the -- two days in a Statewide meeting -- I'm sorry.

Pat, did you have a question.

MR. HOLMES: I just had a footnote to Coral and Becky's comments on tribal help and personal use history as sources for folks getting things straight out for their own subsistence, myself included, not getting fish. I find that more of the commercial fishermen are sharing a home pack both here and on the Alaska Peninsula. And so that's been a great help to have people giving me fish when I can't get out.

And also I wanted to point out that the Sun'aq Tribe has developed a really important program with their small, little fish processing plant where they put up home pack and meal size portions for the elders. And so some of the folks that I normally would bring fish to said well, that they're covered by the tribe helping them out much like Chris was talking about out at Adak. So I think our communities, whether it's commercial fishing, everything supports local people for their sustainable food.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. And that's a good reminder too because Chris didn't bring enough of the home packs I think that the tribes have done. They have also -- it's part of their covid money that they received because we last year and this year did receive a case of salmon filets from Peter Pan Seafoods. And that helps a lot to have that for your winter supply. So it's basically a gift.

Okay. Any other comments in regards to Council member reports before we move on.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I do have one for Coral though. I'm curious on the migratory bird you mentioned the various things that you're looking at I think and on the emperor geese and it would be nice to try to get some information on how or where they're at. I know there was a point when they first -- before

```
0023
```

we first started even having the hunts on looking at changing the way the surveys were being done and whether those numbers needed to be changed in the areas that were being surveyed and also of course updating and changing those regulations. So any kind of informationI think me as a Council member that I can — that can be shared with us to get — maybe get to Lisa and then she can share that with us would be very beneficial.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, Lisa would definitely know who to get in touch with about the surveys, any questions about the surveys. And then what was your other question?

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: The process of changing the regulations....

MS. CHERNOFF: Oh.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:keeping us

informed.

MS. CHERNOFF: Oh. Okay. Yeah, next meeting and I'll send Lisa the process of -- it's just like anything else, like submitting a proposal, if you have proposals or if you're having issues of harassment then you call enforcement. Enforcement if you think there's -- you know, because there are hunter issues sometimes of harassment or being on land they're not supposed to be on, you know. hunting on lands. Yeah, just deal with enforcement through enforcement and then the surveys there are -- is it -- yeah, I don't know who's doing the surveys now, but she'll get you in touch with them.

But you can always come at anytime and I'll start sending out lists of our -- we have two State meetings a year and I'll start letting everyone know, make sure that you all know when the AMBCC meetings are and you can comment there at anytime.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. I may talk a little bit more about this as we go in the next couple days, but right now I'm just not quite ready.

 $$\operatorname{So}$$ as far as Chair's report I did like I said did attend the last meeting by conference call.

```
0024
    You do have a letter I think that references the
    actions taken for Kodiak/Aleutians proposals, but it
    was a long two days of proposals basically. But other
    than that really I think it's going to be nice to be
    able to attend the next one face to face because you
 5
    get more impact and just being able to talk to people
 7
    and question people when they're there has a lot more
    effect I think than in trying to do things by
    conference call on that large of a level.
 9
10
11
                    I was also notified by that.....
12
13
                    MS. HAYDEN: Della.
14
15
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, it -- I'm
16
    having a hard time hearing you again.
17
18
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right. I'll
19
    try to get closer to the mic.
20
21
                    MS. HAYDEN: Thank you.
22
23
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           The other thing
24
    I think for purposes I did miss the approval of the
25
    minutes of the previous meeting.
26
27
                    MR. HOLMES: Move to approve.
28
29
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Motion made by
30
    Pat.
31
32
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Second.
33
34
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second by Coral.
35
    Discussion.
36
37
                    (No comments)
38
39
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris, do you
40
    have a comment.
41
42
                    MR. PRICE. No, Madame Chair.
43
44
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Call for
45
    question.
46
47
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Question.
48
49
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All those in
```

0025 favor of approving the minutes signify by saying aye. 2 3 IN UNISON: Aye. 4 5 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Opposed same 6 sign. 7 8 (No negative votes) 9 10 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Motion carried. 11 12 (Teleconference interference 13 participants not muted). 14 15 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: For housekeeping 16 please mute your phone. I'm not sure if somebody was 17 trying to talk or not, if you can go ahead and repeat 18 that. 19 20 Rick, was that you? 21 22 MR. KOSO: Della, I -- you get real 23 quiet once in a while there too, it's hard for me to 24 hear once in a while, but most of the time I can hear 25 you and understand you, but that could be old age too, 26 getting to where I can't hear so good. 27 28 But anyway I just wanted to bring a 29 couple more items up on Adak that I left out on my 30 opening statement there, if it's okay? 31 32 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, go ahead, 33 Rick. 34 35 MR. KOSO: Yeah. Well, in Adak there we do have -- we're facing a problem with the Navy out 36 37 there when they clean their unexploded ordinance and 38 their clean up. You know, they -- the entrance to the 39 creek to Lake Andy has been blocked off and that's 40 where we get a substantial amount of reds that come up through that creek. 41 The last few years people have 42 been gone out on the north side there and harvesting 43 their reds there for subsistence and other uses. it's been blocked off and we're afraid that because 44 it's been blocked off for the last couple years we're 45 46 going to lose our red salmon returns. And I don't know 47 how much -- how long it's going to take now for that --

you know, because we lost a couple years there already

and we've been with the Adak Community Development

48

49

Corporation we had John Moller to talk to the Governor and the people in Juneau to see if we can't get the Navy to open that up, but with no avail, we weren't able to. So I've been meaning to Lisa and talk to her on that, but I figured that was a done for this year so I'll have plenty of time to do that with her a little later, get some -- maybe get some answers to that. But's it a big concern for everybody because Lake Andy is a very safe lake for people to go and get subsistence salmon. It's accessible by road and it's just a lot safer for a lot of people to be able to get their subsistence there. So it's a big concern to the community of Adak and I forgot to bring that up when I was yapping there.

So that's all I have.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rick.

Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you. I had a question. So with that is it the road access to the creek to Lake Andy, is that, Rick, what is blocked?

MR. KOSO: Yeah. We have -- we do have a road that goes out. Yeah, I think you're inquiring if we had road access, right?

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. You said that entrance to the creek has been blocked and so that's what I was wondering, it's road access to previous.....

MR. KOSO: Yeah, we do have road access out there, but the Navy had blocked it off due to the unexploded ordinance and clean up that they're doing out there. They don't let anybody past a certain mark so we're unable to get out there right now. We're hoping to change that and eventually get out there so we can get that cleared out there, let the fish come. And I think we're a little later for this year for doing that now because I think the fish have already either spawned out in the ocean or disappeared now. So I'm not sure on the exact stuff on that, I'll have to get a report maybe from Lisa when she comes on that can give us a better update on that.

So yeah, that's about it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Coral,

0027 are you good? 2 3 MS. CHERNOFF: Yes. 4 5 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat. 6 7 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Andrew there is on the north side of the island so it's 8 9 open to storms and when the creek gets blocked and the 10 salmon can't get up to spawn the ones that are left in 11 the lake and they become kokanee which are little, tiny 12 red salmon that might get to 18 inches long. 13 when that stream gets blocked it messes things up for 14 five or 10 years. And so I think it's so important for 15 them to be able to get that stream opened up and get normal escapement in there. And I wish you well, Rick, 16 17 on your politics there to get that cleaned out before 18 next June so that you can keep that most important red 19 run on Adak Island going. 20 21 Thank you, Madame Chair. 22 23 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. 24 Rick, are you good? 25 26 MR. KOSO: Yeah, I'm good, Della. 27 28 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Anybody else. 29 30 MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair. 31 32 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral. 33 34 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Della. Yeah, 35 I guess I just have a question with, Rick, is there 36 anything that you are asking us to do or that can we do 37 or can we write a letter, submit a letter, I don't know 38 what would be the process, but I guess I'm asking if 39 there's anything that you're asking for us to do or if 40 there's anything that we can do to help that process? 41

And so

KOSO: You know, I think right now because of the timing of this whole thing, I think it's a little late for this year, I mean, the reds have pretty much come and gone now. And so we have until next June I'm hoping to get something done there. I'm not sure how long the Navy's going to be there, I think they're about ready to wrap up their -- you know, their clean up out there. I'm think it might be this year if

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

49

I'm not mistaken, but Adak Community Development Corporation which I've been a member of for the past 15 years, we've been working through -- you know, with the Juneau and with our representatives to try and see if they can get some folks to get the Navy to open that up and have the contractor that's working there do it. But to no avail, we were not able to do that and we went through all the doors that we can get through. And like I say we're too late this year, but we're hoping to get it rectified by next year so we don't completely lose our salmon returns.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.

MR. HOLMES: I think Coral raised a good point and I think being as we are a Federal Subsistence Committee I think it would behoove us to write a letter and I'd be willing to work with Rick on that to go to whatever respective agencies and to the State and the Governor, Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife Service, we can probably get a list from our Coordinator as to who we could contact and just tell them that's -- the importance of that system and ask them that as part of their work that they make sure that the stream is open before next June. I think a little bit of politics on our help -- on our side would help out the folks at Adak quite a bit.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. And I think it also raises -- this is Della. It raises the question on jurisdiction. Because I'm not familiar with it is this Federal lands and State waters or what exactly are we dealing with. And the reason I bring this up, Rick, is because in the past we had -- this Regional Council had sent letters in regard to the issues with caribou that went to the main Board to try to have assistance and try to rectify that situation and it was a process that was long, but it did happen. And if we need to have that assistance besides getting the letter to whom -- to be able to do that I think it may be worth looking at before this meeting is over.

MR. KOSO: Yeah, Della, I think that there's the Alaska Maritime Refuge in that area. But right now I think the Navy has control over that area

for the clean up on the unexploded ordinances that they're doing out there. I think they're contracted out to do that. And they do contract other people to go out and do a lot of work. So we've been working to try to get the Navy to do it, but like I said we're not — we weren't successful on doing that. So I think the letter from the Subsistence Board, I'm not exactly sure until I get to talk to Lisa, ask about it, maybe she could, you know, give us a little better answer as far as steps we should take on that and the steps that they could take on that. So I think we need a little more information on that and I think we do have time, I'd like to try to get this done before the next summer season.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So, Rick, I have one more question. This is Della. You're basically asking them not to block it, but you're not -- it's not for harvest purposes and I'm saying this because the question is unexploded ordinances and the clean up. But you're mainly asking for it to be open for escapement; is that correct?

MR. KOSO: Yes, that's all. We're just asking for the creek to get open to -- from the ocean to the lake there. It's not a very long creek that goes from the ocean to the lake there. So it wouldn't take much, it's just that we need to get at that to be able to do that. I think we could get some people locally to open that up if we could get the permission, but so far we weren't able to get the permission.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I think we can kind of think this through a little bit.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:before our meeting's over and try to come up with some sort of solution or direction.

MS. HAYDEN: Madame Chair, Della.

Natasha, is that you.

 MS. HAYDEN: Yeah, thanks, Della. Just housekeeping again. Somebody needs to mute their phone. There's a lot of background noise coming through on the phone.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.

Coral.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I think we're ready to move on. There's -- the list Pat's provided, questions and answer from prior meetings that he had requested and I know he has asked this probably in the last three meetings to -- these items to be added. And if it's appropriate I think I'd like to -- I don't know if we need a motion for this or just a Council consensus that these items be added to the minutes because he would like them to go on record. I don't know if there's an issue of process that we need to follow and if somebody can help us with that.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Thanks, Della. Yeah, read through these questions and I don't recall these questions coming up at our winter or spring meeting. So I know that these questions have come up in various discussions about the closure reviews. I don't think I agree that they should be part of the minutes for the That being said, I think that all of winter meeting. these questions very -- they're very relevant to the closure reviews and I expect that we're going to touch on every single one of them during out discussion about the closure reviews. But as far as adding these to the minutes I do not think -- as I recall I don't think that these were actually brought up during discussion. And we didn't have a lot of specific discussion about the closure reviews at our last meeting.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, do you want to address that, please.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I put those in there because those -- not the whole discussions, but the major points on there were points that I raised and that I feel that they should be discussed for each system, particularly for Unalaska. The length of the streams, the quality of the escapement, those things were never discussed, I mentioned them, but we didn't

get a response. An so I think that should be part of the whole review process and I think we could -- if you don't agree with me, Becky, we could ask for the recorded thing because they can give it to us verbatim, but they were discussed and I would like to have my questions that were raised and other people raised, I'd like to have those in the minutes of our meeting today.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

 MS. SKINNER: Yeah, so I agree, I can go back and look through the transcript of the last meeting. If the question is adding these to the minutes of today's meeting I don't have a problem with that because obviously they have been handed out, we're talking about them. I just -- I don't recall this level of specifics being discussed at our last meeting of which we have minutes in our packet. But I will go back and look at the transcript and I would suggest maybe we table this until later in the meeting.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rebecca. Chris.

MR. PRICE: I have a question on who does transcribe the minutes and what's their thought on what Pat's saying here, did -- are they in there or did we just -- did we miss them, what happened. I'm trying to understand what happened.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think, Chris, I do recall Pat bringing these up in the last two meetings and I know that he has, I do recall it. guess my question though at this particular point if they're wanting to have this on the record, but also his point of these questions not being answered. some of these I think if they're shared with a larger group and in particular looking at Fish and Wildlife and ADF&G, if they're able to pull some of this information together, answer some of these questions, when they give the agency reports it might be worthwhile to share this list with them if we're able to and that I think would help the process. As far as in the minutes like Rebecca said we can maybe add this to our meeting as we go, but some of this I think can possibly be answered through the course of the next day or two if it -- and then at the end of the meeting maybe we can decide what should -- if we need to go any further, take any further action with this list is what

1 I'd recommend.

3 MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, I think that makes sense. And I just -- I guess for people who are listening to this discussion to remind everyone that various members of the Council participated in numerous calls about the closure reviews and not all of those calls were meetings of the Council. So what we're talking about or what I understand the request is to add these questions to the minutes of our winter meeting and that's where I disagree that the level of detail and the question was discussed at our winter meeting. I do agree that the substance of this came up during the multiple phone calls we had during the closure reviews, but those are not the minutes that we're talking about today. But I do have the transcript from our last meeting open, I'll look through it and if I, you know, find that there is a public detail I'll be happy to withdraw my objection to it. I just don't think that that's the meeting where we had this detailed discussion.

And again we $\,\,$ — I fully expect we are going to get to every one of these questions and issues during our discussion of the closure reviews today and tomorrow because these are valid and relevant points.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Rebecca. Lisa.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Thank you, Madame Chair. I would like to ask Katya Wessels to answer the question that Chris had regarding who -- how we do our minutes of the winter minutes.

Thank you.

MS. WESSELS: Thank you. Katya Wessels for the record. I just -- yeah, I wanted to address the question that you had, Chris. It's usually Council Coordinator who summarizes the transcripts for the minutes. The sole purpose of the minutes is actually it's a requirement by the Federal Advisory Committee

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

Act because all the Councils including your Council chartered under the Federal have been Advisorv Committee Act that requires us to have the minutes prepared. But minutes contain just the outline of your meetings, the main points made. And I do know the real -- if you want to know the real substance they're in the transcripts. That's why all the meetings are transcribed. And if Pat wants to get the answers to his questions by putting them in the minutes doesn't -will not get the answers. You know, it's better to discuss these questions during the meeting and, you know, hopefully the right people will provide the answers. But we'll raise them and, you know, Council can even put a specific request to an agency to get the questions answered. But just adding this list to the last meeting minutes will not do anything really.

16 17 18

Thank you.

19 20

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,

Katya. Lisa.

212223

24 25

26

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Yeah, to everybody listening and I just want to remind you if you -- to mute your phones, please, somebody -- we've got some interference. So you can mute it -- if you can't mute it on your phone then try star, six.

272829

Thank you.

30 31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Katya. I just lost my train of thought. Oh, yeah. I think the other piece of this with our minutes with our minutes is for a while we had the same Coordinator. And then the last couple years we've had multiple Coordinators. So having a Coordinator that's familiar to working with us as a Council helps a lot when they're putting these minutes together and what we kind of expect to have in them. So as we move forward hopefully Lisa is going to be able to pot that load.

Thank you. We will address this again toward the end of the meeting, but maybe we can get this list out to various agencies. That would be great.

45 46 47

44

Thank you.

48 49

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. We have somebody -- your phone needs to be muted. I know you probably don't want us listening to whatever you're doing. So please mute your phone.

All right. We're going to go ahead and move on here. Oh, I'm sorry.

Scott.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, do you have anymore comments.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I didn't mean to imply any negligence on the part of OSM, it was I think and oversight because in recent years they've gone to more of a action minutes rather than addressing all the topics specifically. My intent is just that we discuss those points as we're going through the closure reviews. And that's it, no offense implied.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. And those reviews are on the agenda. So we will move on. So the next item on the agenda we can do really fast is service awards.

I'll turn it over to Lisa.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Please mute your phone. Yeah, so the OSM, Office of Subsistence Management, our Federal Subsistence Program and the Regional Advisory Council, we every five years of your service we like to acknowledge our thanks and appreciation for all of your hard work. And so we have one of -- Pat Holmes was honored the last time, but he didn't receive a certificate so we would like to give that to him today. And then also Della Trumble is receiving her 25 year award.

(Applause)

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: And that's remarkable and we hope you continue another 25 years. Okay.

0035 1 (Laughter) 2

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And Chris Price five years. So thank you for being on the Council.

(Applause)

6 7 8

9

10

5

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Be we would like to ask Glenn Chen as we have the honor of having him here today and we would like you, Glenn, to present the awards.

11 12 13

Thank you.

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

2526

MR. CHEN: Good morning again, Madame Chair and Council members. Yes, I have the distinct honor and pleasure to present these awards to these outstanding Council members. As a side note many of you know that our Regional Director, Gene Peltola, retired at the end of July. And one of his final acts as BIA Regional Director was to designate me as the Federal Subsistence Board member for BIA, as an acting member until we get a new Regional Director. So today I'm here actually as a member of the Federal Subsistence Board to present these awards starting with Ms. Trumble. And I have a prepared statement to read if that's okay.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

So you've served since 1997, that's Della Trumble has served amazing. on Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Advisory Council since its inception with a few brief intermissions between her appointments. This amounts to 25 years of which 23 you've been the Chair. You're from King Cove, an amalgam and descendent of your amalgam ancestors that have lived in the Aleutian Alaska coastal region for thousands of years. Her family has and continues to harvest resources from the land in commercial fisheries for generations. She was taught the way to do things by her family and continues to pass that knowledge to her family and to others that want to learn. Della is currently the CEO of the King Cove Corporation and she has served also as a Financial Manager since 2008. Since the 1970s she has been on many Boards and Councils related to fish and wildlife issues. She has always been concerned about protecting the local resources and keeping people informed. Over her career she has made countless contributions to strengthen and fight for betterment, safety and sustainability of her

community. Through her actions Della recognizes the value of forming partnerships to local governments, her community, Native corporation, local tribes and State and Federal agencies and recognized by Senators who represent us from all walks of government.

Very remarkable, Della. How remarkable, 25 years of service on this Council. The Federal Subsistence Program and the Council would like to acknowledge and hardily thank Ms. Trumble for 25 years of outstanding and dedicated service to the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council.

So I will walk up and present you.

(Applause)

(Taking pictures)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Glen. And just I didn't realize this was 25 years and my how time flies. I think I recall standing up here with Melissa Berns five years ago which is probably the last meeting we had in Cold Bay getting a 20 year recognition. So I thank everybody and I have to kind of chuckle when I watch Glenn hobble up here with his knee and I'm hobbling around with my knees and my how we've aged, but we're still here. But thank you, I do appreciate the honor and I -- just the honor serving and helping the people in Kodiak/Aleutians. I think it's something we should all teach our kids to be mindful of, our environment.

Thank you.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Before we continue if whoever's -- mute the phone because we have interference if you can hear us, please. That's star, six or mute your phone, please.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Glenn.

MR. CHEN: All right. The next person we'd like to recognize is Mr. Christopher Price who's been on the Council since 2017.

We would like to heartily acknowledge and thank you for five years of service on the

Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory Council. appointed in 2017 as I mentioned and you were elected Secretary of the Council last winter. He's a resident of Unalaska and serves as Executive Director of the Qawalangin Tribe and has been a key contributor to the 6 tribal group of the Qawalangin Tribe, Unalaska 7 Corporation and the CEO of Unalaska over the last three years working with the Mayor and the OC Board altogether for the benefit of the community. 9 10 been a tireless supporter and voice and advocate for 11 the Qawalangin community and natural resources of the There's hardly any aspen in management including 12 Unalaska region. aspect of fisheries research in 13 14 guiding, weir operator, subsistence fisher, 15 contaminants, ethnographic and climate research that Chris has not been involved with nor a Federal or State 16 17 or international organization that Chris has not worked 18 with.

19 20

21 22 We thank you again for the rich knowledge that you bring to the RAC through your life experience and your passion for the community and its resources.

232425

Thank you.

26 27

(Applause)

28 29

MR. PETERSON: Five years goes by

30 31 32 really fast.

(Taking pictures)

33 34

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: May I continue?

35 36

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Glenn.

37 38

39

40 41 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Madame Chair. As mentioned earlier Mr. Pat Holmes, you were recognized on September 27, 2021 for 20 years of service starting in 2001, but you didn't receive your certificate because of the situation with covid and our inability to meet as a Council. So we'd like to remedy that.

43 44 45

46

47

48

42

The Federal Subsistence Program and the Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council thank you for your dedicated 20 years of service and the Federal program and the Kodiak/Aleutians Council look forward to your continuing valuable service as a

```
0038
   Council member.
 2
 3
                    Thank you, Pat.
 4
 5
                    (Applause)
 6
 7
                    (Taking pictures)
 8
 9
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            All right.
10
     Thank you, Glenn. Much appreciated.
11
12
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.
13
14
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.
15
16
                    MS. CHERNOFF:
                                    Thank you, Glenn, for
17
    that and for the recognition. And I guess during this
18
    time I'd like to just recognize Rebecca and I who have
19
    been here seven or eight years now and we've seen
20
    people get several recognition awards.
                                                 We'll be
21
    expecting ours next time.
22
23
                    (Laughter)
24
25
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: With a song and
26
    dance. Well deserved. If somebody would like to ask
27
    for a recess I've got a phone call I need to make so if
28
    we can take 10 minutes I would appreciate it.
29
30
                    Thank you.
31
32
                    (Off record)
33
34
                    (On record)
35
36
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           Okay, troopers,
37
    if we can work our way back to our seats we can
38
    reconvene.
39
40
                    (Off record)
41
42
                    (On record)
43
44
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            And again for
45
     the record please mute your phone. And just a reminder
46
     that if you are the public and would like to speak,
47
    please fill out a blue card or let us know if you're
48
     online. And at this time we'll.....
49
```

0039 1 MR. KOSO: I'm here, Della. 2 3 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. 4 you. Natasha, are you back online? 5 6 MS. HAYDEN: Yes, Della, I'm here. 7 Thank you. 8 9 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. 10 We'll move on to public and tribal comment on nonagenda 11 items. Is there anybody that would like to speak at 12 this time. 13 14 (No comments) 15 16 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. 17 none, we can come back to that if need be. Under old 18 business, 10A.... 19 20 MR. VAN DAELE: Sorry, Della. Can we 21 still do a tribal comment? 22 23 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah. Go ahead. 24 25 MR. VAN DAELE: Yeah, sorry about that, 26 I was trying to find the unmute here. This is Matt Van 27 Daele, the Natural Resources Director for Sun'ag Tribe 28 of Kodiak. And we'll have just a quick update for you 29 today and we're looking forward to hearing the outcome 30 of fisheries closures because we stand in favor of 31 protecting access to subsistence activities and 32 wise management and conservation especially of 33 subsistence resources. 34 35 And along those lines we remain gravely 36 concerned with the Buskin sockeye situation. We feels 37 it's imperative for the Council to seriously consider adding sockeye smelt enumeration and evaluation to your 38 39 priority needs list. We at Sun'aq intend to apply for 40 that FRMP grant year to begin a smelt enumeration project on the Buskin. 41 And if you would consider 42 placing Buskin sockeye smelt research on your priority 43 would definitely help our grant writing list it 44 efforts. 45 46 And we have -- it's unfortunate, but 47 some Council members don't realize that we have been 48 getting crayfish reports over the last several years and we've been doing a significant amount of work with

49

crayfish. And for more details about our efforts I'll turn it over to Daniel Smith, our Tribal Biologist.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

2526

27

MR. SMITH: Yeah, thanks, Matt. Here again, Daniel Smith, Tribal Biologist with the Sun'aq Tribe. Yeah, as Matt had said, Matt and I are with the Sun'aq Natural Resource Department, are currently researching invasive crayfish signal population dynamics within the Buskin River watershed and are worried just how much the crayfish are affecting the sockeye salmon rearing environment within the lake and the upper Buskin. These ongoing studies include investigating seasonal and biannual crayfish movement patterns through an acoustic tagging study, population abundance estimate through a mark recapture study and a crayfish dietary analysis study through stable isotope testing. Based on recent findings we have observed areas with high crayfish density which is largely over opting with sockeye, pink and coho salmon spawning grounds at the far side of the lake where sockeye salmon spawn and within the upper Buskin River where the pink and coho largely spawn. And given that signal crayfish have an omnivorous and opportunistic diet it is likely that these crayfish utilize food resources including salmon eggs in such areas. Lastly we have also seen salmon fry and salmon smelt predation by signal crayfish and foraging on salmon carcasses.

28 29 30

31

32

Our current crayfish research with the stabilized isotope analysis study will likely find out the extent of such egg, fry and smelt predation during different points of the year.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

Unfortunately the crayfish are here to stay within this drainage, but our hope is to bring down the population to manageable levels where they can with the Buskin salmon. coexist This year the community of Kodiak is fully onboard to help us with our research efforts where outreach events and crayfish derby days were a bright spot for us. Just to mention one of them, at the main crayfish derby day in early August 86 volunteers showed up to capture crayfish and 1,021 total crayfish were removed from the lake during a four hour period. These were eaten at a boil that we had on site. And unfortunately as Coral had mentioned we were limited in our capture of crayfish this year due to the new ADF&G regulation prohibiting public harvest, but we have still managed to capture 5,500

plus crayfish so far this year through our suppression efforts and community involvement where members of the public an sign on as volunteers. And this is done underneath an aquatic resource permit that we applied for through Fish and Game Sport Fish. The 5,500 plus crayfish is significantly higher than last year's total of those that we had removed from the lake of 2,821.

And so overall this year has been great for us with just catching many crayfish. Our removal efforts, sample collection for our stabilized isotope study to analyze crayfish dietary make up and crayfish population dynamics will continue into next year through the winter months.

And that's all that I have regarding the crayfish update today. Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We have a question here from Rebecca if you can hold on.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, thanks for the report. I wasn't aware that the Council received an update on the what crayfish are eating study. It's something that we heard about and I know I was waiting to hear the outcome of that study. So I just wanted to make sure I understood what you just reported. So you found that the crayfish are eating did you say eggs and sockeye eggs and smelt; is that correct?

MR. SMITH: So we haven't specifically seen egg predation, but due to the crayfish life history and just how opportunistic they are with more activity through different points of the year they're going to be foraging a lot higher during those periods of time and so it is very likely just because of how opportunistic crayfish are and the presence of crayfish in these spawning grounds on the upper Buskin as well as in the sockeye salmon locations, that they're going to be utilizing these food resources and inside these reds.

But....

45 MS. SKINNER: Okay. And then -- sorry, 46 go ahead.

48 MR. SMITH:part to your other -- 49 oh, yeah, in part to your other question, I've

specifically seen this year and last year live fry that were being eaten by signal crayfish.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. Thanks. And then can you elaborate on the scope of that problem, do the crayfish eat a lot of fry or is this a little bit of predation or do you not have a sense of that just yet?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, that's right on point. You're absolutely right about we don't have a full on sense of how much predation these crayfish are doing to the salmon, but as part of my grad school study through the University of Alaska Fairbanks that I just started I'm doing a thesis related to this same exact thing with stabilized isotope analysis which is basically a way that you can determine likely the extent of the predation through analyzing carbon and nitrogen within crayfish samples and then plot that against potential food sources analyzing carbon and nitrogen of potential food sources such as salmon eggs, salmon fry and salmon smolt, salmon carcasses and then as well as other plant resources that crayfish likely utilize. And so this research that we're doing with collecting samples throughout the entire course of the year, we want to really key in if they are utilizing salmon eggs and more of a carnivorous diet to see whether there's a shift in what they're eating, what the carbon and nitrogen values from let's say the spring throughout the summer where red salmon spawn and then into the fall where coho salmon spawn. And so this will give us a really good snapshot of, you know, what the crayfish are eating during different times of the year.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$ SKINNER: Okay. Thanks. That was really helpful.

MR. VAN DAELE: And to add on to what Daniel was saying there too, the stabilized isotopes are going to give us basically the proportion of diet of meat versus vegetable. We're not sure if it's going to give us an actual amount, it probably would not based on kind of a limitation of stabilized isotopes, but if we were to add something else on, like mercury, and to be able to look at actual mercury concentration, that would probably give us a better idea about potential amounts versus just proportions.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.

have a question. You wrote a comment in part of your report to in the process of bringing down the crayfish to manageable numbers, you said ADF&G prohibited public harvest, was that -- what exactly was that of the crayfish or salmon?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. So this is public harvest of crayfish and so late last year and when the regulation got passed earlier this year, Fish and Game was worried that public — the public would potentially whether accidental or intentional, move crayfish to other waterbodies. And so currently under this regulation the public could only harvest crayfish with either Matt or I on scene and eat them through, you know, such as like a crayfish boil at the lake.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.

MR. VAN DAELE: And -- yeah, we were not informed more concisely whatsoever when this regulation was coming down. That was very unfortunate, but we have since submitted an agenda change request to the Board of Fisheries in August and we are requesting that public capture of crayfish be resumed in the Buskin and only the Buskin because this is a -- this is now considered a bad invasive species and fortunately they're only in the Buskin right now and we want to keep it that way too. We do agree with Fish and Game with that. But we're hopeful that this ACR is going to be taken up at the upcoming Board of Fish meeting in So hopefully next year we will be able to February. have managed public harvest resume of signal crayfish because realistically that's the most and probably only effective means that we have to reduce this population.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Coral.

MR. POLUM: Mrs. Chair, this is Tyler with Fish and Game in Kodiak.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tyler.

MR. POLUM: Okay. Hey -- sorry to interrupt, I realize this is tribal comments, but I just wanted to if crayfish comes up later in the meeting, I just wanted to give a little bit of

background in addition to Matt and Daniel's comments there. Just so folks know in addition to what Matt and Daniel said there is a Fish and Game proposal to change the way those regulations that Matt referenced are They don't -- they don't just deal with written. crayfish, they deal with a whole suite of invasive species Statewide. And so if the -- there is a provision in there that would allow for harvest of some invasive species, one of which would be signal crayfish. And so that -- that's in addition to what Matt and Daniel have said. And that's coming up. This is a -- as Matt said was an unfortunate byproduct of some regulation changes, but there's several different things in the works that will come up as -- in addition and that's on a Statewide level too so not just with signal crayfish, but several other Statewide invasive species issues too.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.

20 Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Della. Thank you, Daniel and Matt for reporting on the crayfish. I have a few reproductive cycle questions. I was just wondering one, how old are the signal crayfish when they can start reproducing and another, I know they can carry quite a few eggs, if there's sort of a rough number about how each -- how many eggs each female can carry if you know those things.

Thank you.

 MR. SMITH: Yeah, related to the reproduction of signal crayfish, we don't have an exact number of, you know, related to the age of these signal crayfish to when they start being sexually mature. We have more so of a idea of carapace size at which they are sexually mature. And that's kind of the point of when they're transitioning from juvenile to adults is usually around the 30 to 31 millimeter carapace length. And Matt might know a little bit more about an estimating on age of sexually mature crayfish.

But in response to your second question about the fecundity of signal crayfish and you're definitely right about how crayfish produce a lot of eggs throughout the year, but maybe not as much as you'd think. There's definitely around 300 to 400 eggs on a typical female signal crayfish. And sometimes

that number varies obviously depending on the -- how large of a crayfish it is. Obviously the larger that the female is the more it's going to produce, but usually it's around that two or 300 to 400 eggs, but obviously that number could change by eggs being stripped off of the crayfish, but just recently we are seeing since the crayfish are now starting to egg lay, that number's going to be a whole lot higher right now. And what Matt and I are going to do this winter is really characterize the fecundity of these crayfish. We're doing lab work to estimate how much eggs are on a typical female.

MR. VAN DAELE: Yeah, and to Daniel's point some of the things we're seeing in the Buskin are very different from what has been written in literature about signal crayfish elsewhere around the world. And what the literature suggests is probably about three to four years old they reach sexual maturity, but unless we have a means of growing some in a lab and really being able to mimic wild conditions in the lab we're not really sure we're going to be able to estimate the age. But what we can do is through all of our captures potentially build and through mark recapture population model just like crab biologists do to start forecasting out crab cohort that are coming up during the years. And that's something that we're kind of hoping to do to help better understand the population as a whole. And again it was mentioned too that the literature suggests about 200 to 400 eggs per female crayfish that on bearing eggs. We are going to be counting some of these females this winter in the lab and then so we can just start getting kind of a spot estimate just by being able to look at a female and estimating how many eggs she's got.

And one of the other really interesting things that we found a couple times this year a female crayfish with juvenile markings and the juvenile markings are more cryptic, they're more camouflaged versus kind of a -- the uniform rusty red/orange, brownish/orange color of an adult, but we found a couple of juveniles or crayfish with juvenile markings that actually had eggs on them which is very strange. And also just a couple days ago we managed to catch our first female crayfish with brand new, fresh eggs because this is the time of year that they start breeding and then they extrude their eggs and attach them to their swimmerets and carry them throughout the

winter and throughout the next summer to hatch in July and August. So now with that capture of that one female we can capture the complete life cycle of signal crayfish in the Buskin watershed. So that was pretty interesting from a biology standpoint.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: That you, Matt. I just have one more question. Are you guys -- do you study and capture in the lake only or are you guys looking throughout the river for crayfish and if you are have you noticed any increasing populations throughout the river?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. So a lot of our efforts have focused mainly on the lake the last two seasons earlier in the year due to just increased activity of fishermen on the river for sockeye and pink salmon. And so a lot of our efforts early on in the season have focused on the lake where there's the high density areas in the bouldery substrates along the southern coastline of the lake. But last year and this year in August when the upper weir is removed from the upper Buskin for enumerating their sockeye salmon we really focus on the upper Buskin River. And that area all the way down to about a half a mile downstream from the outlet of the lake has an abundant population of They're virtually, you know, under every crayfish. rock. And these are a dull crayfish. I couldn't tell you exactly whether or not we have seen an increasing population within the river, but I know last fall after a major flooding event that there was a crayfish that had been washed up in Fish and Game's lower weir site near bridge two as well as a crayfish that had been seen at the Lake Louise weir site and that was last year as well.

MR. VAN DAELE: And to tag onto what — to Daniel's points too, it's — we have a — I mean, it's a very impressive number of the amount of crayfish that we caught this year, but I think it really comes down to three main factors and it's not necessarily the population is increasing because it's not like we've seen a lot more juveniles or anything, I think the main things are we're spending more time out there doing this, we're getting better at doing this because we're

spending so much time and there's also no more public So there's probably kind of a surplus harvest. abundance of crayfish right now for us to capture. I think those are the main three things of why we have 5 such an impressive capture number this year. 6 7 Thank you. 8 9 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Thank you 10 for your report. Any other comments or questions. 11 12 (No comments) 13 14 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. 15 Moving on, number 10, old business. Under A, 16 805(c) report summary. 17 18 Lisa. 19 20 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Yes, Madame 21 Chair, members of the Council. Again just for the record my name is Lisa Hutchinson-Scarbrough, I'm the 22 23 new regional Council Coordinator for this Council and 24 the designated Federal officer for the meeting. 25 Council members -- okay, if you could look in your 26 meeting book on page 15 it is the letter and the enclosure.... 27 28 29 (Teleconference interference 30 participants not muted). 31 32 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: 33 the letter and enclosure from the Federal Subsistence 34 Board. 35 36 Could I remind somebody to please mute 37 their phone. 38 39 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rick, it sounds 40 like you. Can you mute your phone. 41 42 MS. LaVINE: To those of you listening 43 online, this is Robbin LaVine, Subsistence Policy 44 Coordinator with the Office of Subsistence Management. Some of those -- some of you who are participating in 45 46 the conference online have your phone unmuted and when 47 we hear you we cannot hear the people in the room. So 48 we are requesting people to mute your phones unless you

are speaking. And if you don't have a mute feature on

0047

49

your phone, I believe you believe you press -- could you guys in the room remind us what we press?

Thanks.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Yes, thank you, Robbin. It is star, six to mute your phone and if you need to speak then it is star, six again.

Thank you.

Okay. So anyway on page 15 is a letter and the enclosure from the Federal Subsistence Board known as the 805(c) report. This report provides the action taken by the Board on proposals affecting residents of the Kodiak and Aleutian regions. I believe the Chair has already provided a summary of the Board meeting and actions taken, however I will provide a brief summary. This is not an action item. Again it's on page 15 if you want to follow along.

So section 805(c) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act provides that the Board will accept the recommendation of a Council regarding take unless one, the recommendation is not substantial evidence; supported by two, recommendation violates recognized principles of fish management; or three, adopting the and wildlife recommendation would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence needs. When the Council's recommendation is not adopted the Board is required to provide the reasons and facts for their decision to the Council. And these are provided in the annual 805(c) report.

As you can see from the 805(c) cover letter this year, the Board acted on 59 proposals and 16 closure reviews for the 2022 to '24 wildlife regulatory cycle. The Board agreed with the recommendations of the Regional Advisory Councils in whole or with modifications on 50 of the 59 proposals. The Board accepted the recommendations of the Regional Advisory Councils on 15 of 16 wildlife closure reviews, voting to maintain status quo on 14 of them.

As you know the Board uses a consensus agenda on those proposals where there is an agreement among the affected Council, a majority of the ISC and Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The consensus

6

7

9

agenda contains three proposals affecting Kodiak/Aleutians region, adopting WP 22-37 with the OSM modifications to recognize customary and traditional uses of ptarmigan by all residents of unit 9D. WP 22-38a which recognizes the customary and traditional uses of caribou in unit 10, Unimak Island for residents of Cold Bay and Nelson Lagoon. And WP 22-38b with the OSM and Council's modification to remove the caribou closure from the unit 10 regulations and delegate authority to the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge Manager.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

There were also three proposals Kodiak/Aleutian region affecting the on nonconsensus agenda. Of the three proposals the Board with action consistent the Council's The Board adopted a Statewide recommendation on two. proposal, WP 22-01, which clarified who is and who is not a participant in a community harvest system and how that affects the community and individual harvest limits Statewide. And the Statewide proposal WP 22-02 which removed the language from the designated hunting regulations prohibiting the use of a designated hunter permit by a member of a community operating under a community harvest system.

262728

29

30

31

32

The Board's action differed from the Kodiak/Aleutian Council recommendation on one proposal on the nonconsensus agenda which was WP 22-39. As you will see recommendations from three Councils differed. The Board actions on this proposal are explained in detail in the enclosed report.

33 34 35

36

37

So this is just a formal opportunity to bring your attention to the Board's action in document form. This is for your information only and again this is not an action item for the Council.

38 39 40

41

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Thank}}$ you, Madame Chair, members of the Council, for your attention. I am ready to answer questions.

42 43 44

 $\mbox{{\tt MADAME}}$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Any comments or questions.

45 46

47 MR. PRICE: Madame Chair.

48 49

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

```
0050
 1
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris and then
 2
    Pat.
 3
 4
                    MR. HOLMES: Where can we find that WP
 5
    22-39?
 6
 7
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Page 18.
 8
 9
                    MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
10
11
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                             Chris, do you
12
    have a comment.
13
14
                    MR. PRICE: Yes, on WP 22-01. Where do
15
    I find that?
16
17
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            These were all
18
    in the last round of proposals that went to the
19
    Council, the big Board meeting in I want to say
20
    February, March. We can pull them up, Katya.
21
22
                    MR. PRICE:
                                    I mean, this is the
23
    discussion we had this morning about this issue and I
24
    would like to know more about this as we move through
25
    the meeting this week. That would be interesting,
26
     Della.
27
28
                    MR. WESSELS:
                                  This is Katya.
                                                   You can
29
    find it online actually in the Board meeting material.
30
    You can find the full analysis on our website and if
31
    during the break you want my help I'll help you to find
32
     it.
33
34
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           So I quess that
35
    raises a question though, Christ, what specifically are
36
     you referring to in regard to the designated hunting
37
     regulation, is there something specific?
38
39
                    MR. PRICE: Just in terms of who is and
    who is not participating in community harvest system
40
41
    under the Federal regulations versus the State.
42
43
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            So his question
44
    is who is not a part of the customary and traditional
    under Federal and State, traditional use.
45
46
47
                    MS. WESSELS:
                                   We should have Wildlife
48
    Division member online with us now so they will be able
49
    to answer this question.
```

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Kendra, are you on the phone with us.

MR. VICKERS: Katya, hello. This is Brent Vickers, Division Supervisor for OSM. If Katya -- oh, is that Lisa there. I was going to say I'm happy to try and answer questions unless Lisa.....

MS. HOLMAN: Brent, it's Kendra. I'm on the line. I'm really having a hard time hearing the question. Can it be restated.

MS. WESSELS: Can you restate your question.

MR. PRICE: Okay. Sorry. I'll talk louder into the mic here, my apology. Proposal --Board adopted Statewide proposal WP 22-01 which clarifies who is and who is not a participant in a community harvest system. And I would like to find out more information on that between the definition of, is that the -- I'm assuming that's a Federal subsistence rule and not a State. So in our community when we have a State fishery, subsistence fishery, is this -- you know, how will the definition of who is a participant in a community harvest system, how will that be interpreted. That's what I'm trying to understand.

MR. VICKERS: Kendra, would you like me to take this?

MS. HOLMAN: Yes, please, Brent. Or Lisa's online, she could answer this one a little better than I can, either one of you.

MR. VICKERS: I'll start since I already introduced myself. Again this Brent Vickers, Division of Anthropology Supervisor for OSM. And this is — you're right, this is regarding Federal harvesting, Federal regulations only on Federal lands and a community hunt is something that can be established for a community in regulations or having a framework in regulation in which those who are participants of this community hunt system are able basically to have a bag limit for the community—wide rather than per individual. And so that enables a lot of flexibility within communities and who is doing the majority of the harvesting and distributing the meat to

other participants in a community hunt. Now before and this is -- to have a community hunt you have to go through a process of establishing one through our regulations. As far as I know there's not actually many, if any, community hunts in this area, but 5 nonetheless prior to this regulation which you're 6 7 speaking of, who is and who is not a participant of the community hunt, the regulations basically said that all 8 9 members of the community were participants whether they 10 really wanted to be or not. And it came to our 11 attention that there was actually community members living in communities particularly in -- along the 12 13 southcentral area, the eastern interior, that members 14 of these communities that have an established community 15 hunt didn't want to participate in it, they wanted to 16 be able to have their own individual limit rather than 17 have a community wide one, they wanted to be able to 18 have -- it should be to people outside of the community 19 hunt which they weren't able to do. And so what this 20 regulation does it gave people living in communities 21 the capacity to not participate in a community hunt if 22 they're living in that community. So now it just 23 basically makes it easier, gives people flexibility if 24 they have a community hunt in their community, they can 25 participate in it and if they don't want to be part of 26 that community hunt they can choose not to participate 27 and therefore retain their own individual bag limit.

28 29

30

Does that help answer your question and if Lisa wanted to add anything go ahead, but hopefully that answers your question.

31 32 33

34

MS. GREDIAGIN: Okay. Madam Chair, this is Lisa. If I could just add a little bit to that.

35 36 37

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Lisa.

38 39

40

41

42

MS. GREDIAGIN: Yeah, for the record this is Lisa Grediagin. I'm the Wildlife Division Supervisor at OSM. And WP 22-01 only applies to Federal community harvest systems so it has absolutely no affect on any State community hunt or fishery.

43 44 45

Thank you.

46 47

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Hearing no other questions we will go ahead and move on to the Federal Subsistence Board

49 50

FY 2021 annual report replies.

Lisa.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Thank you, Madame Chair. And this is Lisa, Council Coordinator. So if you look on page 19 of your Council book. I'm going to present you with a brief summary of the Federal Subsistence Board's FY '22 annual report reply to what the Council submitted this July. The materials for this agenda item again on starting on page 19 of your meeting book. This is not an action item.

The Board appreciates your effort to communicate through your annual report to the Board on issues outside of the regulatory process that affects subsistence users in your region. In FY '21 there were six topics of concern on the Council's annual report.

Topic one was in regard to staffing levels at the regional Refuges, the Kodiak, Izembek and Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuges and at the Subsistence Management. The of acknowledges staffing challenges across the Federal agencies and recognizes the importance of adequate staffing at remote Refuges like Izembek, Kodiak and They acknowledge the number of critical Maritime. vacancies that interfere with important functions and research, particularly caribou populations annual survey completion. The Board appreciates the Council's support of communications between the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge and the villages and agrees that this improves community outreach and was pleased to confirm that there was a hire of several critical Staff in the three different Refuges as well as within the Office of Subsistence Management.

Topic two was in regard to the lack of applicants for the Council vacancies within their region -- within your region. The Council requested that OSM provides the Council with feedback during the Council's application process which would help the Council to conduct outreach in their communities. The Board understands and shares the Council's concerns regarding the vacant seats on the Council. The Board through OSM will continue conducting comprehensive application outreach throughout the region and the targeted outreach by your -- by me, you new Council Coordinator. The Board appreciates all efforts from

the Council members to conduct outreach in their communities and encourages other residents to apply to seats of the Council and hopeful that in 2022 appointment year will result in a fully seated Council. Right now we have two vacancies.

Topic three was in regard to food security and how covid-19 pandemic restrictions have worsened food security primarily through the disruption of the food supply. The Board recognizes that covid-19 is continuing to highlight food insecurities -- food securities in Alaska and they share the Council's concern with this problem. The Board will continue to be flexible and responsive to its efforts to help Alaskans meet their subsistence needs through the regulatory process. Many persistent changes to the seasonality and availability of resources due to issue like climate change can also be accommodated through the submission of proposals as part of the normal regulatory process and special action request.

Topic four was in regard to the Council's concerns over invasive species of crayfish on the Buskin River which we were able to have a good discussion on that here short -- a little bit ago. The Board recognizes the ambitious work by the Sun'ag Tribe Kodiak to better understand the complex interrelationships between salmon and the non-Native signal crayfish in the Buskin River drainage. Board noted that in 2021 the State of Alaska adopted new regulations that reclassified the signal crayfish banned invasive species. This regulation as a prohibits a person from possessing, importing, propagating, transferring, releasing, purchasing or selling within the State any life stage of organism listed under this classification. The Board encourages rural residents to be vigilant in their early detection of invasive species and recommends reporting any suspicious sightings to Fish and Game invasive species hotline which is 1-877-468-2748.

Topic five was in regard to Council's desire to see that the Fisheries Research Management Program or FRMP projects also support an eradication of invasive species that can affect or complete with --compete with the wild resources utilized for subsistence. The mission of the Federal -- the Fisheries Research Monitoring Program is to identify and provide information needed to sustain subsistence

fisheries on Federal public lands for rural Alaskans throughout a multidisciplinary collaborative program. Eradication is not considered information gathering and therefore cannot be funded through the Monitoring The Board recognizes the importance of Program. studying and mitigating the impacts of invasive species and refers to the ambitious project by the Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak that we just had a report on by Daniel and And they also encourage that there's further research into this topic by all organizations within the capacity -- their capacity to help to ensure the resiliency of subsistence resources.

 Topic six was in regard to the Council's appreciation for the support of Staff shown relating to the Unimak caribou and sea otter issues. The Board relayed your appreciation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Office of Subsistence Management Staff and Paul Schuette of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Marine Mammal Division mentioned -- and he also mentioned that he would be glad to discuss with the Council any questions you might have in the future.

And the Board thanks the Council members for representing the concerns of the Kodiak/Aleutians region throughout your annual report.

This concludes my report, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Lisa. Any comments or questions.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Maybe just one comment in regard to staffing and then I know we as a Council did have multiple coordinators over the last few years. So, Lisa, we're glad to see you working with us and welcome you and hopefully you will be here longer than six months.

Any other comments.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Correct me if I'm wrong,

but I think we were -- were we going to have a report from these Yetta folks and they had to cancel out?

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: That is correct, Pat. I think they will report at the winter meeting in Kodiak is what I understand.

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Madame Chair, this is Lisa. Yes, he was scheduled to present when the -- we had to adjust the meeting dates because of our transportation issues, he was not available, but he said he'd be happy to present in the winter meeting or if you have any questions before that to please let him know.

Thank you.

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I just had a comment and I don't know if -- so in the Board's response to the crayfish and Alaska Department of Fish and Game adopting the regulation prohibiting the person from possessing important -- you know, the whole thing to do with the crayfish. I'm a little disappointed that they didn't mention that this did not travel the regular route that regulations do for the Department of Fish and Game. And I think for the purposes of our meeting here I would just like to note that, that there wasn't consultation with local entities and this did not travel the regular route that Fish and Game regulations travel, by going to the Advisory Committees and getting public comment. So I would just like to note that that was left out of that part of the report. But I think it's important because nobody consulted.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, Coral, I feel the same way you do, but I may be in correct, but I believe that basic statute is already on the books and the fact that it was raised, that they came back and said well, this applies for Kodiak and you really shouldn't be messing with any invasive species. I know there's quite a bit -- I've heard arguments that some

of the State biologists are trying to get them to do a different interpretation on that and there may even be a proposal before the Board to discuss an exception for Buskin. But I do appreciate your frustrations because it came right out of the blue and surprised a lot of folks, but I think it might have been on the regs.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there anybody online from ADF&G that can comment to the -- Coral and Pat's comments they just made.

MR. POLUM: Yeah, Madame Chair, this is Tyler Polum, Fish and Game Kodiak. I heard -- it's still pretty quiet so hopefully I didn't mishear anybody, correct me if I'm wrong. But the current -the regulations regarding crayfish in the Buskin, you know, were not solely intended for Buskin crayfish, they were an attempt by the State of Alaska to and in part due to the request that tribal entities like Sun'aq specifically, some of the comments that RACs around the State have made and ACs around the State have made in regards to getting the State to recognize invasive species in a regulatory way. The State crafted a set of Statewide regulations aimed at encompassing invasive species, you know, a whole list of invasive species that we deal with and potential new invasive species to try to put some teeth to those regulations in terms of moving those species around the State or importing them or possessing them. hopefully that makes sense.

So in essence what happened though was and a consequence of that and probably unintentional consequence of that was that it made it illegal to harvest Buskin crayfish which is hopefully going to be remedied at the upcoming Board of Fish meet --Statewide Board of Fish meeting in March where there's a new proposal to change the previous regulations that I just mentioned to create a new set that encompasses different tiers essentially. So there's some that we don't want people to possess in any way, shape or form because they're harmful and then there's some that can allow some harvest like Buskin crayfish. So that's coming up and that's a current proposal.

And so just like the current regulations we have it will go through the normal Board of Fisheries process and the Kodiak AC and other ACs have the option to take those proposals up at anytime

```
0058
```

in their regular meetings. It -- you know, they can take up whatever proposal they want so if at an AC meeting somebody wanted to take that up then they would need to put it on the agenda and so forth. So that all is in the works just like it was for the previous one. Yes, it's an unfortunate situation we're in currently, but hopefully it'll be remedied very shortly.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Thank you. Just a housekeeping rule for anybody that's speaking on the microphones. We do understand that you're only in some cases only hearing half of what is being said so if you're speaking try to get closer to the mic. Appreciate it. And hopefully during lunch we might try to figure out another solution to what's going on with the -- this problem. I don't know, Leticia, if you were able to find a conference phone at the City or something that we might be able to use.

MS. MELENDEZ: No, she does not have one, she couldn't find it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. All right. Well, we'll try to figure something out here at lunchtime.

All right. Thank you, for your comments. And, Pat, do you have another comment?

 MR. HOLMES: I was just wondering if it would be appropriate for our Council to send a letter to the Alaska Board of Fish or is that out of jurisdiction. I think it might be worth something to support getting a more specific regulation to allow harvest.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, I think -- go ahead. Hold on.

MR. AYERS: Madame Chair, I just wanted to let you know -- this is Scott Ayers for the record. Sorry about that, I'll try to speak up. That you do have that on your agenda already to speak to the Board of Fish proposals if you'd like, but I wanted specifically to note that this is proposal 169 related to the invasive species topic.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. That's basically what I was going to add, but that's

more specific. So, Pat, we will be able to, we can pull that when we get to that part of the agenda.

MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right. Let's go ahead and move on to item number 11 and that's agency reports, applicable information for Council consideration addressing Federal fisheries proposals and closures review. So the first one under that is Alaska Peninsula and Unalaska escapement and subsistence harvest. And that's basically Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Tyler, you're up next.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Hello, this is Vince. Sorry, I had to leave for a minute, but what's the schedule look like?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So, Vince, we are -- right now we are on the agency reports and the State is up to discuss the Alaska Peninsula/Unalaska escapement and subsistence harvest reports. So you're just in time. Perfect.

MR. LAWSON: Good morning, Madame Chair and members of the Council. My name is Tyler Lawson and I'm the Assistant Area Management Biologist for the south Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands. Della just announced the title here of what I'll be talking about and if you're following along this is the supplemental pad item number 1 which is posted online.

So as the title shows here we're going to be talking about some of the updated harvest, we'll be talking about our most recent subsistence harvest numbers and escapement numbers for Adak, other Aleutian Islands and over to the Alaska Peninsula. We'll be focusing on a lot of these FCR proposals that have been talked about today and in the past and we'll also be talking about some of the other important subsistence systems in this region which have come up at recent RAC meetings.

For the escapement data that I will be discussing we'll be going back several decades in some instances so they'll be a combination here of fixed wing aerial surveys, some foot surveys, some fixed

weirs and also more recently we're doing some drone surveys in certain locations. So I'll try to kind of point out which of those survey methods were used for the various escapement numbers that I'll be discussing here.

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

So to get you kind of adjusted, we have a pretty big region here that we'll be talking about so the sockeye salmon that you see there kind of indicate those general spots. I'll be starting way our West in Adak to talk about the -- what's going on out there as far as we know, moving over to the Aleutians Islands primarily to talk about Unalaska and then finally moving over to south Peninsula area to talk about some of the things going on with Russell Creek, Trout Creek and some of the other important subsistence systems here.

17 18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

So first off FCR 23-12 is for Adak and Kagalaska waters. So if you're looking at our map here I added a star and a couple of labels here which you might not see if you're following at home, but the -kind of the town of Adak is that black star there, kind of the northcentral nook and cranny a little bit to the east there, so that's where the runway and most of the old Navy buildings and current existing buildings such are and there's a road system near that area which heads up to Lake Andrew. I think Rick referred to it as Lake Andy. And the FCR mentions Hidden Bay, Galas Point and Quail Bay with Hidden Bay being down in the southcentral stream there. Galas Point is on Kagalaska Island to the right there and it's on the west side of And Quail Bay is down in kind of the the Island. southeast corner.

343536

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

Because Adak is so far away it's not feasible for us to get out there to do any surveys for escapement unfortunately. So I reached out to the family out there that does primary engage in subsistence fishing just to kind of ask them what that run's looking like and what they know and I'm sure Rick Koso could also chime in with his personal experience, but based on what he said the best run is down in Quail For sockeye escapement Galas Point has a good run, but it's very challenging to fish due to the rocks that are there and I guess the seals will just get right into the nets and start plucking fish as soon as the net is out if they try. And Hidden Bay's a small run. And he also said that Lake Andrew or Lake Andy is also a very strong run and that's where a lot of their recent subsistence harvest is coming from. So it sounds like at least in recent times that's the most important spot there for catching their salmon.

4 5 6

7

8

And this is the photo that was added in, this is the photo that that user sent showing the south side of Adak. So it might be over in that Hidden Bay area. So just a little quick visual of Adak there.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

And the next -- these are data from our area management report. And it's in graphical format here to look at some historical Adak subsistence salmon harvest. This is going from 2000 until 2020. And for this chart and all of the other subsistence data that I'm going to talk to you about today, we have finalized numbers through 2020. Our data lagged behind a little bit because it just kind of takes some time for all of those permits to finally trickle in. And so at some point in the next few months here we'll get around to finalizing those 2021 numbers and those will be published in our area management report here and we can provide an update on those numbers at the next RAC meeting, but you'll just be seeing subsistence harvest numbers primarily through 2020 here today.

252627

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36 37

38 39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

49

50

So that being said we kind of start to work through this here. Over on our Y axis we can see the number of salmon harvested and as far as our different species represented there, red of course is for sockeye and you can see far and away that the primary species that are harvested out there in Adak are sockeye with much lesser amounts of pink and the occasional coho out there. If you follow that black dotted line, that is the number of subsistence permits that the Department has issued and so you can see it kind of bounces around quite a bit out there in Adak. If we were to go back into the '90s I think there used to be maybe 40 to 60 permit holders. And for that dotted line, I'll point you over to the right Y axis, that shows you the number of permits issued if you're trying to see that number. So for example back around 2000 and 2001 there's approximately 15 to 16 permit Again if you went back further when the holders. military base on Adak was active there was a lot more whereas in the last five years here there's really just been a couple of people at most that are getting permits to fish out there. You can see though for the last few years that those few people who do go and fish they can get out there and they can find a decent number of sockeye when they do go out there to look for those fish and there's that red dotted line which is showing the 2015 to 2019 sockeye salmon average for a comparison just to give you an idea for kind of the recent average of what is reported for out there.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

5

So moving over to Unalaska Island. of the primary systems here which I'll be discussing. So we kind of start towards the middle there, that black star shows Dutch Harbor and so as you kind of work your way around there is a road system out there which will run down along to Unalaska Lake, Summer Bay Lake and all the way out to Morris Cove. So those are all spots that people in town can fairly easily access to get to for fishing whether it be for sport or subsistence. If you go from Dutch Harbor about a 30 to 50 if not longer minute skiff ride depending on your weather and boat and other variables, up around the corner there you get to McLees Lake which I'll be discussing here briefly and we'll have separate, longer presentation about it and the weir that's out there. I'm guessing that'll be tomorrow. And that tends to be the primary subsistence fishing spot out there. And I'll also mention it's not a FCR, but another really important spot on Unalaska Island is a spot called Volcano Bay. And that's one where it takes several hours to get all the way up and around and down and around to get to, but people who have the right boat or the right weather do oftentimes in more recent times get down there to get some reds where it seems to have a pretty good sockeye salmon return.

32 33 34

35

36 37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

So looking at our subsistence harvest for Unalaska for 2000 to 2020, kind of the same story as what I went through for Adak as far as how this chart is setup to show number of salmon harvested on the left Y axis versus number of permits issued over right there. towards the So we tend approximately a couple hundred households out there with permits. I'll point out here that it looks like it picked up in 2020, but I think in reality that number actually went down, it's actually more of an artifact of how we mailed out and auto renewed permits And I think based on that and what we due to covid. saw for kind of missing return permits that year, that year is actually probably more of a part of a decline that we see there for the number of people who are actually fishing in the last five years or so.

Chris Price might be able to kind of chime in on if he agrees and what he's seen out there and such, but if we kind of look at some of the species breakdowns here, again sockeye are far and away the most important species for harvest on Unalaska Island with much lesser amounts of coho, pink and a very occasional chum and even more occasional chinook out that way. So the 2015 to 2019 average of approximately 3,000 sockeye and the last few years that we have finalized data for are a little bit below that recent average there.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40 41

42

7

9

And so here this is kind of breaking down some of those more specific areas on Unalaska Island and focused on the sockeye harvest since again that is far and away the most important species out there for harvest. And so if you look at this year, typically what we see in most years Reese Bay or Wislow Bay, and these are the saltwaters which are right next to McLees Lake so it's a little bit confusing there, McLees Lake is the freshwater for the lake where the salmon escape to and just outside there is Reese Bay also known as Wislow Bay. And that is where most subsistence fishing occurs -- that's where all the fishing occurs actually is in those waters right there. And in most years that's the dominant run on the Island. I think 2020 was the only exception where the McLees run didn't do very good and we'll talk more about that later. And probably as a result of that a lot of people went down and around to Volcano Bay so Volcano Bay actually was the dominant spot for harvest in that particular year. So you see that Reese Bay/Wislow is really important there, Volcano Bay at times can be also important and then if you look elsewhere around the Island there's much lesser amounts of harvest being reported from Broad Bay, Wide Bay and the Unalaska Lake vicinity is kind of in third place which is that orange one there. The purple one I kind of mentioned is largely inclusive of Volcano Bay so that's other locations and that's where we lumped together Volcano Bay, some of the other Unalaska Bay systems, Summer Bay and then just other really small systems that might just report one or two sockeye here and there.

43 44 45

46

47

48

49

50

As far as escapement goes, so looking over at Morris Cove which I believe is FCR 21-09, is a general kind of catch all for escapement if we're looking out to the Aleutians and to a lesser extent even here on the Alaska Peninsula, our ability to get

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

15

17

18

out there and survey depends on weather conditions and what we have going on for our fisheries here in the Alaska Peninsula that give us the time to get out there and actually do those surveys. So you'll see that we have data for some years and not for others and then also we tend to focus more on systems which are a little bit bigger and have bigger runs. And I mention that because for Morris Cove you'll see kind of a lot of missing spots here where we haven't done surveys. And that's largely because Morris Cove is a pretty tiny which can be overlooked at time. nonetheless we do have survey data for this system going back to at least 1977 and in particular we see 14 that we can have quite a few pink salmon that show up in the system, there's that really big outlier in 1983 and I was able to find the survey notes and corroborate 16 that. That was done by a very experienced biologist during times where he had excellent visibility so that 19 outlier seems to be reality and that was just a really 20 good year for the pink salmon in that system. And then elsewhere you can see some lower numbers there.

21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

If we fast forward to the right side there, 2018 until 2021, I have a little drone above those lines there signifying that this is a system where we've been doing some drone surveys. And so on Unalaska Island the Department of Fish and Game has been working with a local contractor who has acquired funding from several of the entities that are on Unalaska, they pay him to conduct the surveys and then he will send that video into us and we'll review the footage to estimate escapement. And we've got quite a bit of footage, we tend to get three to four individual surveys of that system and it's increasingly great quality and we're really kind of starting to dial it So I think those are pretty good numbers as far as aerial survey numbers go. You know, in general aerial surveys can be tricky based on your weather and wind conditions. Even if it's good enough to fly, you know, it could be a cloudy day where it's hard to see in the water, the water itself could be kind of turbid or kind of windy on top so you can have some variations. when we fly fixed wing surveys we're lucky as you can see here if we get out to Dutch Harbor once every year, if not every two or three years. So the ability to get three or four surveys in in the summertime with this method has been really helpful to get some better escapement numbers. So I think those are pretty good data there for 2018 to 2021. So you can see Morris

Cove, pretty small system, at most a few hundred sockeye and pink salmon the last few years and I think last year was only like maybe 54 or so sockeye were seen in that system.

4 5 6

7

9

If you head over to Summer Bay, that's a bigger lake, bigger system, bigger runs. Kind of a similar story as far as how often we've been able to get out there to do fixed wing surveys. I think there's an occasional foot survey or two here, Pat Holmes might have done one of these back in the day possibly.

12 13 14

11

MR. HOLMES: Three of them.

15 16

MR. LAWSON: And -- three of them.

17 18

(Laughter)

19 20

MR. HOLMES: George Pappas as well.

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40 41

42

44

MR. LAWSON: Yeah. So in addition to the aerial surveys and foot surveys for 1998 to 2001, we have the asterisks there, there was actually a weir in operation. It's my understanding that there's some sort of an oil spill outside of Summer Bay there and there was funding provided to have a weir there to monitor how the salmon run return at that time. those data are pretty precise and a good representation of what that run looks like for that time. And then in turn you can kind of compare that to the 2000s and 2010s there would be what aerial surveys and foot surveys we could do and then again 2018 through 2021 would be our more recent drone surveys which we've been so those give you a pretty And representation there of the number of pink salmon and sockeye salmon that we see there so your pink salmon ranging from about 4,000 to 7,500 or so and the sockeye kind of bounce around there between maybe 4,500 to I think maybe just 1,500 last year and a little bit less amount of coho. The drone surveys typically aren't done late enough in the fall to really capture the peak of the coho run so we're just really kind of starting to see some of the first ones that are poking in during these drone surveys.

45 46 47

48

We'll head over to Unalaska Lake proper also called, hopefully I won't butcher this, Iliuliuk Lake. We had escapement data for this going back to

1970 and I've broken this chart down, I'm going to have a separate chart for sockeye and pink salmon to talk Pat Holmes already brought this one up about it. before. It's developed from past RAC meetings and from other members of the community that have contacted us talking about some of the habitat degradation issues 6 7 out there. And a lot of the comments that we have received are saying that if you look back there used to 9 be like this incredible sockeye run in this particular 10 lake. And so this is the data that we have for that 11 system, again it's a combination of aerial surveys, a 12 couple of foot surveys and then the more recent drone 13 surveys since 2018. In this case you'll see an outlier 14 there for 2004. In that particular instance that was a 15 foot survey done with very poor water quality conditions by an inexperienced biologist and I'm a 16 17 little more skeptical of that because they said in 18 their notes that they had some trouble differentiating 19 sockeye from pink salmon and I'll show you pink salmon 20 here in a second and you'll see what I'm getting at 21 But and I think if we look at some of these here. 22 numbers here that historic average for sockeye, if you 23 look at all the numbers it's just below 500 and our 24 most precise recent data from these drone surveys for 25 the past few years are kind of bouncing just above and 26 below that historic average. So I'm sure that there 27 certainly is some habitat issues going on in some parts 28 of the lake where you have different operations and 29 different buildings and different things going on. I'm 30 not sure how much it could possibly help the sockeye 31 based on what we know here of these most recent numbers 32 and it's also possible if you go back further in time 33 which data we don't have unfortunately that when the 34 military was first out there they probably had some 35 other impacts early on. I did find a -- I had a article sent to me by a colleague in Dutch Harbor 36 37 talking about them putting blue stone, like copper 38 sulfate basically in the waters around World War II 39 because one of the lieutenant's wife or something like 40 that hated the smell of dead salmon. So they killed the salmon to get rid of it. So yeah, luckily that was 41 42 a long time ago and not a recent thing that I'm aware of, but that could possibly kind of play a role in why 44 people have this perspective that that sockeye run used 45 to be much better.

46 47

With that in mind though go to the next slide here. So same system here, Unalaska Lake, my guess is that maybe people are confusing that really

49 50

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

great salmon run there in general with what has happened with the pink salmon run in the system. So if we look at the pink salmon here, that historic average, about 6,000 or so in 2004. Prior to that we see some really big numbers of maybe 20 to 30,000 pink salmon escaping whereas in recent years just a fraction of that. So I think it's very likely that some of those habitat issues that have occurred there certainly have had an impact on the pink salmon. So I guess the question is how much of a priority is it for those pink salmon seeing that they're not sought after subsistence and other uses out there. So I think --I'm sure Pat and Chris will have something to say about that we can try to sort through, but these are the data that we have to the best of my knowledge and the best representation of what we know about the history of this particular system and what's going on there.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

So again if you go for a big, long skiff ride and hopefully you have south winds for a couple of days to knock down the Bering Sea in your favor, you can make it out to McLees Lake. And so we're looking at this picture here, we're actually looking in the saltwaters of Reese Bay also known as Wislow Bay with some people subsistence gillnetting there for sockeye salmon. And kind of just over this beach would be the freshwaters of McLees Lake. And this is a lake where we do have a weir in operation thanks to OSM funding which we'll be talking about in a lot more detail here.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

So looking at McLees Lake sockeye escapement and harvest. And again this is typically the most important system on Unalaska Island. show you a very similar chart here later on, probably tomorrow when we give our separate talk about the McLees Lake weir and I'll get more into the escapement. For right now I'll just say for this past year we did hit our escapement goal and exceeded it by a decent little amount, but the run was very late. And then otherwise I'll kind of focus more on talking about the number of subsistence users out there again with the black dotted line and those numbers are represented by that right Y axis there. So we can see that there has been a bit of a decline in the number of people that have been heading out to McLees Lake over the past several years. And where the blue part of the bar is showing the escapement coming from the weir out there in this case. Stacked on top of that, that gray bar is

going to be the reported subsistence sockeye salmon harvest so it gives you an idea of the total run which is going on out there. And again for -- we only have that subsistence harvest through 2020 as we do for all the systems and we're lacking the escapement data for 2018 and 2019 unfortunately because there was no funding for the weir and the weir was not in place during that time. And I think as far as a general range here you can see that for escapement again we reached our goal the last couple of years, we did not in 2020 and I'll probably save other parts of the discussion here for later on when we give our separate talk talking about McLees Lake.

So moving over to the Alaska Peninsula part of the region and looking at our subsistence salmon harvest should be the same format and setup here as those charts I showed you for Adak and Unalaska So again far and away the most important species out this way is sockeye salmon with much lesser amounts of coho, pink salmon and chum salmon. look at the number of permit users there in the black dotted line again seeing kind of a general decline in the number of those permits which have been issued so the number of people that have been fishing under a permit in this region and with the sockeye being typically our most important species, we have the red dotted line there showing you the 2015 to 2019 average of approximately 8,000 sockeye being harvested and you can see for the last few years where we have finalized data those run sizes are a little bit below the historic average.

And so here we have a map looking at Cold Bay proper here and try to kind of work your way around here to some of the systems that I'll be discussing. So if we kind of head down towards where it says 284-34.01 just south of Cold Bay and the airport there, that would be Mortensen's Lagoon which is historically a very important if not the most important subsistence area for sockeye in Cold Bay and for King Cove residents as well. And as we head up north to 284-34.02, that is Russell Creek where we had a couple of our Council members and OSM Staff got out on the creek last night to kind of see some of the spots where sport fishing often occurs there. Moving up to 284-34.03 just north of town here and the airport is Trout Creek where there is also sport fishing primarily for coho that goes on. Just above that is a

red circle and that signifies Swan Lake and Swan Creek which in the past several years has kind of shifted and become the most dominant spot for subsistence sockeye fishing for locals in this area. And we'll keep on going, just one more stop up is Kinzarof Lagoon and there's three different systems there that we've lumped together, that 34.05, 34.06 and 34.07, I'll present those altogether, talk about the escapement into the lagoon up there.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49 50

5

6

7

8

And here we're taking a closer look at the sockeye harvest, again deemed the most important species for this area and broken it down by color by some of these important areas so we can see that if you go back a few years you see a lot more harvest coming out of Mortensen's Lagoon. And then as far as the same point in Old Man Lagoon, it kind of varies year to year based on the weather and if people have boats and want to head out that way to get down there and do some fishing. And we've lumped together the north Cold Bay total. Historically when people have reported harvest on their subsistence permits they'll just put Cold Bay and they haven't really signified if they're going to Swan Creek or Trout Creek or Kinzarof Lagoon so that's why those numbers are all kind of lumped together there. So I signify that as the north Cold Bay total. And you can see that for 2020, our most recent finalized data, a really big jump and shift there for the north Cold Bay waters and the amount of sockeye salmon that were harvested. And just kind of a reminder as a regional perspective during 2020 most other spots in the region had run failures for sockeye. And so it's a little bit of a surprise to us to see that there was so many sockeye being harvested in this region, it could be just kind of an anomaly and those little systems have their own little quirks going on and they're doing fine if not better than elsewhere in the region. But we were a little bit concerned and it kind of lead to some of the more recent education and outreach that we've done with users about existing regulations for SwanCreek and elsewhere with come up -came up at the last couple of RAC meetings. So this a graphical representation for why is just prioritized more outreach and education with users about those existing regulations just based on what we saw here and a little bit -- just kind of concerned about a sudden big uptick in harvest in these spots where otherwise there weren't a lot of sockeye around.

0070 1 This is a chart which the Division of 2 Sport Fish provided. 4 Am I too close to the mic? 5 6 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No, no. 7 just -- as you're going through this are you wanting us to ask questions after you're done or when you're maybe going from one specific area to the other like Adak, 10 Unalaska. And I have questions for this one and I don't know if any -- Rick or anybody had questions on 11 Adak and Vince is on the line, I know he's got limited 12 13 time when he's going to be with us, whether he had 14 questions on the Unalaska. So maybe as a suggestion if 15 it's okay with you that we are allowed to ask maybe some questions for more specific detail on what you're 16 17 presenting. 18 19 MR. LAWSON: Yeah, I'm happy to do 20 whatever you would prefer. I think there's just a few 21 slides left and then I promise I'm done, I know it's a 22 very comprehensive update here, but I'll do whatever 23 you guys prefer to do. 24 25 MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair. 26 TRUMBLE: Go ahead, 27 MADAME CHAIR 28 Rebecca. 29 30 MS. SKINNER: Thanks. And are you also 31 going to be available when the Council discusses the 32 closure reviews because you've covered a fair number of different areas and I suspect that when we get into 33 have specific questions 34 them we may about your 35 presentation here? 36 37 MR. LAWSON: Yes, I plan to be here in 38 person in attendance. 39 40 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So I guess given 41 that, Tyler -- Rick, did you have any questions in 42 regard to what was presented for Adak at this point. 43 44 (No comments) 45 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Vince, have you 46 any comments -- is anybody still online? 47 48

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, I'm here. It's

49

```
0071
    Vince. I don't know if Rick heard you.
 2
 3
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, Rick, are
 4
    you still online.
 5
 6
                    MR. KOSO: Can you hear me now, Della?
 7
 8
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. We hear
 9
    you now.
10
11
                    MR. KOSO: Yeah, I'm here, do you hear
12
    me?
13
14
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah,
                                                   I hear
15
    you. Do you have any comments in regard to what
16
    was....
17
18
                    MR. KOSO: Yes.
19
20
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            .....presented
21
    for Adak? I think we're talking at the same time.
22
23
                    MR. KOSO: Yeah. Okay. Della, yeah, I
24
    do have a question for Tyler there. I was just kind of
25
    curious on that Lake Andrew if they were -- did any
26
    surveys on that, you know, the past couple of years
27
    since the closure of the streams to get -- the red to
28
    get in there and if they can give me kind of an idea of
29
    what the future is planned on with them not being able
30
    to get in there and if they did contact the -- you
31
    know, the Navy and the contractors that are doing the
32
    work out there to try to get that open?
33
34
                    MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. Yeah,
35
    again unfortunately Adak is so far away we can't really
36
          out
               there to
                           do any surveys ourselves
37
    unfortunately. The last survey that I'm aware of is I
    think 1 1983 survey from Pat Holmes along the Aleutian
38
39
    Islands. So, I mean, we do have that that we can share
    with you, I'm not sure how relevant it is to what you
40
41
    have going on there right now with the Navy.
                                                   I mean,
42
    we're happy to help out, to kind of talk to people and
43
    make connections. I know Jeanette Alas with our
    Habitat Division does a lot of work kind of similar to
44
    that and she might have contacts with the Navy that
45
46
    could possibly help you out and I'm happy to kind of
```

help you with meeting with her to get that going if I

can be of any assistance.

47

48

2

MR. KOSO: Yeah. Okay. Thanks. I would sure like to see that pursued a little bit because I think it's going to totally kill that run off that's gone into the lake there if we don't do something real quick.

5 6 7

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Rick. Any other questions, Rick.

8

10 MR. KOSO: No, that -- that's all I had 11 there, Della.

12 13

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Vince, do you have any comments or questions in regard to Unalaska.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

14

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you, Della, and thanks for the opportunity to speak on the issues, some of the issues of Unalaska. My biggest concern here is enforcement of these lakes and streams, I mean, I'm totally frustrated with the issue of permits being issued and allowing people to have a permit doesn't give them any more authority to take whatever they want regardless of the amount and nobody's enforcing it. So really I'm really concerned about the lakes in Unalaska, Iliuliuk Lake. The main feeder for that lake is Front Beach. Several years ago I introduced the opportunity to drop that to 10 per permit and what's happened here is that we had several individuals with family members applying for permits and then, you know, you get over 50, 60 and in some cases a hundred fish. But I know of very -- in some cases of people who have taken advantage of that and catching I suppose more than 10 permit for one person in the boat and they've got 25, 30 reds and their excuse is I'm fishing for another permit holder. Well, that's all well and good, that permit states you have to be present, that's not happening for Unalaska Lake. That's causing a big concern for me on the reds and the silvers, the silvers especially.

40 41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

They had a bad run in reds this year, as far as I'm concerned they're getting -- a lot of people didn't make it to get the reds, they were late. And when they came in coincided with a good two days or rain and they went right up. So opportunity lost with the reds. The silvers are a different issue. They -- they're late also, they're big fish from what I've seen and I've caught myself from -- on the Front Beach and

over in Broad Bay and over in Nateeken they're being decimated by illegal vessels, we're calling them the jetboats, the small ski-doos or whatever you want to call them. More people have those than what I've ever seen before and they're going right up the river and they're going well past a lot of areas that you could reach by walking and loading up. I'm concerned about that.

Wislow not so much this time of year for silvers, it's not a very good time to be out there in any case to fish for halibut or anything else, it's pretty nasty out there.

I really don't know what's happening in McLees other than I did have a man tell me that they got over 90, 90 silvers in one day. And that really concerns me that one individual can do that. I'm not aware of others, you know, that tell me about it. But there again it's enforcement. Getting a permit is all well and good, it's good for recording if you're recording properly. For us to attest Natives in this community that we have more non-Natives than we do anything else that are breaking the law. This is concerning.

I'm a member of the Qawalangin Tribe and a subsistence user all my life, this is the worst cases that I've seen in this community ever and it's getting worse. I know that the Fish and Game and the State Troopers are assigned to other places like Bristol Bay and other areas for commercial about the same time we're doing subsistence. I think I brought this up several times when I was on the Council several years ago, when I was living in Adak and I'm back here to Unalaska now. And I'm concerned about that. I know that the counts have gone down, I work with the Tribe and the City who sponsors the drone surveys on three different estuaries, a lake and over the years I've seen a drastic drop in these species of reds and silvers.

The sport fishing entities are lined at up -- as everyone knows in this community line up at Summer Bay and it's like combat fishing over there. And that's concerning that there's -- people are not taking their quota share, they're taking more, in some cases they're just going forthe eggs and leaving the -- mostly the pink on the beaches. Well, it's just a

mess right now and I'm really concerned. I think the proposals that are before us -- before you that are coming up is -- my understanding is to open the lakes to sports fishing which I would oppose based on the history of those sports fishing that does go on and not open to any of them. In fact we should be looking at closing them for a couple of years to gillnetting within -- move that boundary out off the Unalaska Beach and move it over towards the City road going out to Summer Bay somewhere and just give our fish a chance, the silvers and the reds. Not so much the pinks, we're loaded with -- our rivers right now with so many pinks, they're not making it up the river some of them and that's been the case for the last couple of years regarding pinks.

So I -- you know, and what's happening in Adak in regards to Lake Andy, we did have a working relationship with the Navy when they were there in '96, '97, '98, up to 2000, that they would work to -- with their contractors on -- to keep that lake open on the north side there. It's a very rocky and boulders beach similar to what is at the Wislow or McLees Lake. There's not a sandy beach there, it's big boulders and you've got -- you got to basically get down with some equipment and move the boulders apart so they can get the fish to run up the stream. So I understand what Rick was saying, if we don't do something soon they're going to lose the whole lake. We've had a couple of times contractors go out on their own and help the situation by moving a couple of boulders so they can have some sort of a stream to get up. And that's all we're asking. I agree with Rick if they don't do it we're going to lose it.

Any questions from the Council about anything that I said I'm willing to answer as best I can. I appreciate the time.

Thanks.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, Vince, were you on the AC back there in the late '90s or when the State restricted the fishing in freshwater for reds, it seemed to me that folks out there were really strong on not allowing that because they had seen, you know, such a decline particularly in Unalaska Lake, do folks still feel that way?

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Excuse me....

MR. HOLMES: Excuse me, let me do it again, get my face near the mic. I was wondering were you on the AC back in the '90s there when the restrictions were made not to fish reds in the streams along the road system there and I recall talking quite a bit with the AC and folks in town and they just felt that they should not be allowing any fishing in freshwater for those species and that they need to be real careful with the silvers, but do folks still feel the same out there about that?

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes, I would say the majority of those users that associated with, you know, that still support no fishing inside of any freshwater for sports fishing or subsistence otherwise, and that they stay outside the boundaries that have been designated. But there is — there are people that — who take advantage, there's no enforcement and go inside these lakes actually with ski doos and small, little engines with the skiffs to go out in the lakes and fish, sports fish, being in there several times. No action has been taken on it even noting it for the record and that doesn't help our fish population.

So thanks for that question, Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, Vince, and I saw your comments on violations and lack enforcement because when I was out there we had -- I think there were two Troopers, there was myself, some of the folks that worked crab when crab wasn't going on, and the City Police all worked on enforcement, but we had problems then and I couldn't say absolutely, but locals were reporting to me that the processing crews were lying on their resident licenses for sport fishing and I don't won't if some of that might happen on the gillnetting and also the not reporting and semicommercial. There was one guy that Barastoff told me about that was working at a processor that was going

out and gillnetting and smoking them and shipping them out to Seattle, but I never caught him. It's just appalling to me to learn that things are even getting worse out there. So my heart goes out to all your folks.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: If I can....

MR. TUTIAKOFF: In some cases it's still happening and it's unfortunate because they actually brag about it because they know that nothing's going to happen. And it's very frustrating that we that live out here and have lived our life out here, the person wants to be hauled in when there is enforcement and that's kind of -- you know, people are afraid to talk or even go fishing at some point because they always feel like they're going to be suspects for getting the fish. I provide as an elder to the other elders that can't get out anymore, that used to go with me even are house -- have to stay at home and can't get out in the boat anymore. And to get their 10 or 12 fish is all they ask. And I put that on my permit whenever I do this. So I'm frustrated with this whole process right now. I'm concerned about the future for any big runs at all.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Vince. Just for -- I didn't realize how late it was. We have Mary having lunch ready for us at 12:00 and we probably need to break until maybe 1:30 so we can run and eat.

Are you comfortable at this time, Vince, with what you have said or do you need to add to your comments.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yes, Della. I'll be available whenever, if somebody gives me a call on my cell I'll come back online and answer any questions. I appreciate what you guys are doing, I know what it is and I -- sometimes hard decisions have to be made.

Thank you very much.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Vince. And thank you, I appreciated what you said because I believe that's not only in Unalaska that this is happening. When we come into things like food security which is going to be a huge issue as we move

forward I think these next few years. These items are important to try to come to some consensus on and make some good decisions.

4 5

6

2

Tyler, you had maybe a comment, you did raise your hand and then Katya before we break here at 12:30.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

MR. LAWSON: Yes, through the Chair. Just a reply here to Vince while he's still on the line. Vince, I just want to say that the Department of Fish and Game does share your frustration with the enforcement issues out there. We know that we're stretched very thin and it's frustrating to us as well when we hear about all these violations and we're not able to investigate them as quickly and efficiently as all of us would like. We are using what limited resources that we do have to investigate some of the more recent things that are going on out there, kind of all I can say about that right now. And there is a new Trooper that's supposed to be heading out to Dutch Harbor some time in the next few months last I heard and I'm hoping that he'll kind of get onboard to help out. And just also want to say that the State is aware that the locals out there have been really proactive and reenforce the regulations on those freshwaters that are in effect and I did plan to raise that later on when we're talking about the specific systems and the Department is opposed or in support of those various things. So I just wanted to let you know our viewpoints on those things.

31 32 33

Thank you.

34 35

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Did you tell her, Katya?

36 37

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

38 39 40

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you, Della, and I'll be available anytime. Thanks.

41 42 43

44

45 46

47

48

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just wanted to mention to everyone who is on the phone line that Tyler's presentation or any other presentations that we'll have is -- are also posted on our website under the region section in Kodiak/Aleutians meeting materials. So if you don't have a copy of it, the hard copy, you can always look

```
0078
    at these slides there online.
                    And another thing I just wanted to
 3
 4
     extend the official apology to Coral and Rebecca from
    our program that you guys were due for five years award
     in 2019 and it definitely was an oversight on our part.
 7
    We will correct it. We really value all of you Council
    members who've been on this Council, for volunteering,
    for giving your time on behalf of the users in your
 9
10
    region. So we want to recognize your length of service
11
    and we want to present you with a service award.
    it's any consolation for you, you both are featured on
12
13
    the cover of the application packet this year.
14
    there's a picture of it.
15
16
                     (Applause)
17
18
                    MS. WESSELS: Thank you.
19
20
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And
21
    at this time I think we'll break for lunch and be back
    here at 1:30.
22
23
24
                    Thank you, everybody.
25
26
                     (Off record)
27
28
                     (On record)
29
30
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            And also Rick
31
    Koso and Natasha, are you online?
32
33
                     (No comments)
34
35
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            Okay.
36
    going to go ahead and continue on with the meeting, but
37
    can I ask again, Rick Koso or Natasha, are you online?
38
39
                    MR. KOSO: Yeah, I'm on here, Della.
40
41
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Perfect.
42
     Thank you, Rick.
43
44
                    Natasha.
45
46
                     (No comments)
47
48
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. And just
    a bit of housekeeping before we continue on. The court
49
```

2

reporter has -- recorder has asked us to be sure and mute our phones if we are not online. There was a lot of feedback this morning and it's hard to people to hear what the speakers are saying.

5 6

With that we will continue on with Tyler on our agenda.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Again for the record Tyler Lawson here with the Department of Fish and Game, Assistant Area Management Biologist for Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands. And we left off here, we just got over to the Cold Bay area and that previous slide was showing some of the subsistence harvest for the primary sockeye spots around this part. And this slide here was provided by our Division of Sport Fish during the last RAC meeting and it's kind of put here to give it a comparison to those numbers. Their methodology is a little bit different than what we do for subsistence so Tyler Polum can maybe speak to it more if you guys have any specific questions about it. But this kind of gives you a rough idea of some of the sockeye and coho harvest for Cold Bay waters and I believe they would encapsulate everything from Mortensen's all the way up to Kinzarof Lagoon. Most of that sport fish harvest will kind of happen from Mortensen's up to probably Trout Creek and a little bit -- oh, that's Long Creek. really kind of a very rough comparison. Just Approximately 4 to 20 percent of your total salmon harvest in Cold Bay waters is due to these sport fishery numbers so you can kind of take those number and interpret them as you'd like and we can talk more about them later. But you just kind of see some of the changes that we've had there in recent years with the number of coho salmon that have been taken and a little bit of an uptick the last couple of years for some of the sockeye salmon that have been taken. I'm providing this because at the last RAC meeting there was some concern shared about some of the conflict between the sport and subsistence harvest for Cold Bay waters.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

So for the Cold Bay area we'll start down south again at Mortensen's Lagoon so it's a quick photo showing you the lagoon there and that photo on the top right is of the old weir that was in operation I believe from 2001 to approximately 2005 or '6. And that was actually a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service weir which fish and game kind of helped out on with some

1 assistance.

And so this is the data for Mortensen's for escapement and so it's 2001 to 2006, the little asterisk is when that weir is in operation. So kind of nice precise numbers there bracketed by that other estimates of escapement from aerial surveys which are done on Mortensen's. So I got the other side will be sockeye and then I believe the next slide you're looking at coho escapement for Mortensen's because there is sport fishing that goes down there as well. Whereas for sockeye a lot of that harvest is going to be for subsistence fishing, people putting out gillnets down there.

Historically we can see there is a lot more harvest going at Mortensen's so just format similar to previous slides where that black, dotted line is the number of permit holders who went down there to put out a gillnet for subsistence fishing. So we can see a general decline for Mortensen's in the last 10 years and in general for the harvest of sockeye with the blue bar there -- or sorry, the gray there, those numbers are going down. If you look at the blue bar which is for the escapement kind of a few things to sort out here so don't necessarily conclude that the run has declined. There probably is some indication that that has happened, but what also happens at Mortensen's is the water there is very turbid and it's really challenging for us to get a good survey of it until the fish have really moved into really shallow waters to spawn and they're colored up. And along the same lines it's a really late run and we don't really see them push up into a place where we can actually survey them until kind of early September at the earliest. And you can see especially that 2018 through the 2021 numbers the latest survey we were able to get in was somewhat near the end of August so we basically weren't able to do a good survey when those fish are moved up and we can get a good view of them.

In more recent years our budget is kind of limited how long biologists and our pilots are out here on the Peninsula. We get a pay upgrade and basically a COLA when we're out here so it's kind of forced us to cut some of those surveys a little bit shorter for seasonal length whereas if you go back to the 2000s and '90s, we were able to get some later season surveys in. And so some of those numbers will

6 7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

give you kind of a better idea of those numbers compared to the more recent ones, but we do have a lower bound and upper bound sustainable escapement goal for Mortensen's which is from 3,200 to 6,400. And even though we didn't hit those goals for 2018 to 2021, again probably in large part because we weren't able to survey at the best time. We did complete a survey Labor Day and so if you look at 2022, if you're looking at home you're not going to see the updated value, I have it here in person in the presentation. We did see approximately 3,900 sockeye in Mortensen's which does put it above that lower bound CG goal. So this year we were able to do a good survey at the right time and we also lucked out and had really nice conditions down there so we were able to see and it did hit its escapement goal for sockeye this year.

16 17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

And the coho salmon, they're kind of similar story only more so than that, you know, their run is a little bit later in the year and so just kind of compounds the problem that we often have with having biologists and pilots out here to do a good survey of So we had some really good numbers for when the weir was in operation and they kept in place a little bit longer to try to capture some of that coho run. We did see a few hundred coho when we did that Labor Day survey, but unfortunately we're probably not going to have a chance to get down there and do another survey to have an idea of how that coho run is doing. Anecdotal points from some of the fishermen I've talked to said that they're doing just fine catching coho down there. So take that for what it is, but if you look at those historic numbers from when the weir was in place you can kind of see a run between, you know, a thousand upwards to sometimes eight or 9,000 sometimes. that subsistence harvest you can see there. The permit users are the same that we saw for the sockeye so a general decline over the last decade and we saw a little bit of a harvest here and there, but again coho are quite -- they lie quite a bit behind sockeye when it comes to subsistence harvest in the waters around here.

42 43 44

45

46 47

48

49

50

Moving up to Russell Creek. Again kind of similar story for our aerial surveys we're not always out here late enough to do a survey of the coho around here so we have a couple of missing data points. If you go back a few years when we were able to do some better surveys kind of a range between about 2,000 to

seven or 8,000 coho is about what you're looking at for Russell Creek coho run. We did our September 5th survey, we did see some coho escaping into Russell Creek, about 3,800 or so, 3,700 I believe is what we saw there is our most recent number. And we did do a drone survey actually yesterday before all you guys showed up here. We didn't see a whole lot so I don't think it's going to move the needle very much from what we have right there. I think there's probably another push waiting out there for the next rainfall event and the higher tides that would come in next week, they'll probably be some fresh coho coming in, but a little bit sparse yesterday so it's probably the best that we're going to see for this year, but, you know, that value of, you know, approximately 3,800 does kind of fall somewhere in between those more historic values where we were getting some good surveys and.....

MS. SKINNER: Can I ask a question.

MR. LAWSON: Yeah, sure.

MS. SKINNER: I just wanted to make sure in the meeting packet -- sorry for this slide for 2022 it shows something like 400 fish, but this is the updated number so I can go ahead and move the dot up on here, it's like almost 4,000?

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. Yes, that's correct. So we had to have this presentation turned in by August 31st and we conducted quite a few surveys Labor Day, September 5th, and a couple of surveys since then as well, so we do have a few spots here for 2022 where we have more recent data and I'll try to keep pointing those out for you to follow while we're -- as we go here.

So moving up, FCR 21-13 is for Nurse Lagoon. And Nurse Lagoon actually has a couple of different openings, one of them is actually going into the mouth of Russell Creek and another one just out into Cold Bay proper. And that's probably kind of a femoral thing that can change each year based on what the beaches and, you know, the tides and the winds and waves are doing to that general area. That being said we don't see a whole lot of fish there, it's not a place that we generally survey. We looked at all the old survey notes for Russell Creek and didn't really see any mention of Nurse Lagoon. Last year I was down

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

there walking around for some bird hunting and saw one ratty looking chum salmon. We've done basically three surveys the last couple of weeks and we saw one carcass on our drone survey yesterday, I didn't see much bear sign or any other carcasses on previous aerial or drone surveys so there's just not really much going on there as far as salmon go, and I'm not really sure exactly why there was any sort of a regulation for Nurse Lagoon. My best guess is if I went back a few decades to when there was more people here in Cold Bay, more fishing, perhaps that system was a little bit different based on, you know, where the waters were and maybe salmon were moving in there and there was something different going on which triggered those regulations, but in the modern day when I spoke to some of the main users around here they don't know anybody that's fished there, they never fish there and they're not really sure where it's coming from as well. So that's basically what we know about Nurse Lagoon in a nutshell.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

Moving up just north of town talking about Trout Creek and the escapement. So we got some good survey data going back to about 1990. Kind of the same thing here where we have some years especially early on where we have some good surveys especially for the coho whereas we have a little bit of a gap there for more recent years. So there is a little run of sockeye that goes in there, we've seen perhaps a thousand sockeye in some years make it into there. And that would be the reason why there is a closure in the saltwaters out there for subsistence, to keep people from round hauling at the mouth and getting what few sockeye do go into there. And it's one of the most important sport fishing locations for coho in the area, it's really easy to access right down the road here from town and a lot of sport fishing occurs there. If you look at some of their historical surveys for coho surveys there, kind of a range of anywhere from 500 to maybe 1,800 or so. The data -- the new data that I 5th and we have here is from September approximately 300 sockeye and 400 coho and we did do a drone survey of this system two days ago, I haven't had a chance to do a formal review of that footage, but I think that footage will probably bump up the coho numbers to possibly like 500 to 1,000 coho. So best guess sitting here is that this year the escapement is going to be pretty similar to those historical years and averages.

```
0084
```

Keep on shifting up north. So if you cut -- keep on heading up the road there's a four-wheeler trail and if you're adventurous you can take you pickup truck down it as well and basically get over to the beach, get up the beach and there's fishing that goes on at this little spot called Swan Lake. It's a really quirky, weird little system where the water's maybe a few inches deep and the salmon can only escape there at the highest tides of the month, but there has been a lot of pressure shifted around and that's now our most important place for subsistence fishing in Cold Bay.

MS. WESSELS: Pardon the interruption. People on the phone have been dropped, like nobody can hear us at all. I think we need to like recess for like five minutes and find out what's going on.

(Off record)

(On record)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: This is Della, I'm here.

MS. LaVINE: Great. Yep. Della, we 32 can hear you.

34 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,

35 Robbin.

MS. LaVINE: And, Della, for your information we do have Council members Natasha and Rick online as well.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, 42 Robbin. Okay. Tyler, you're back on the pedestal 43 here.

MR. LAWSON: All right. Thank you. I think we've just got one more to go after this so almost done.

So, yeah, kind of pick up, I was

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

talking about Swan Lake. This is one that has come up at the most recent RAC meetings because a lot of our fishing pressure has shifted over to this system. As I was saying before it's a very quirky system in that 5 that outlet is often only a couple inches deep and the 6 salmon can only get up it at the highest tides of the 7 month, maybe just three to five days a month they can actually get up there which means at a lower high tide 8 9 you can several hundred if not a thousand fish all just 10 sitting there at the mouth and it's super easy to 11 harvest them. So it's one that we've been kind of 12 working with here the last couple of years to try to 13 figure out the best strategy to allow people to get the 14 fish there without overharvesting them. My first year 15 out here I wasn't quite aware of the existing regulations for it and we basically had people round 16 17 hauling right here at the creek mouth and getting 18 several hundred salmon at a time. Based on what we 19 know of this system and the escapement that's a lot. So it's another system which is really hard for us to survey because it's very turbid waters nearby. I 20 21 actually just finally saw a dolph in the lake system a 22 23 couple days ago when we did a drone survey. 24 difficult for us to actually know what's going on there 25 escapement wise which is why we've been a little bit 26 kind of conservative and again the education and 27 outreach to people to have them at least 500 yards away 28 from this mouth to allow some of those fish to escape. 29 And based on the feedback that we receive from the 30 users here, we actually reduced that 500 yard closure 31 100 yards this past year to allow for more 32 opportunity for people on the beach to get in there and 33 get a fair number of fish without getting too many fish 34 and still allowing some of them to escape. 35

I'm just kind of quickly showing that map I showed before of the north side of Cold Bay. I'm just going to point out that last we'll talk about Kinzarof Lagoon. There's at least several systems here that get salmon, there's probably a couple more small ones, but these are the ones that we routinely survey for escapement via aerial surveys. And if you lump together all three of those systems we can see of our escapement data here so kind of ranges anywhere from 500 to a thousand at the lower end up to 42 or 4,300 would have been the peak back there in 1995. It's another difficult one to survey, it's very narrow with

little channels of very cyanic water with lots of vegetation overhanging them. So we have to have pretty

good conditions in the water and with the water to actually get a good visual, but we did complete a survey September 5th. I think this was a newer data point and I believe I saw 900 sockeye in the system that had escaped. So kind of similar to that lower bound of what we tend to see for the historical numbers there for Kinzarof and it's a little bit harder to get up there, but people do go up there on four-wheelers to fish in the lagoon for subsistence sockeye.

> And it's kind of bringing things to conclusion here and I want to point out some of the recent actions which Fish and Game has taken in the region to try to help subsistence users. First as I just mentioned after receiving feedback from user after we initially started that outreach to remind them of what the regulations are supposed to be for Swan Lake and that they're supposed to be 500 yards away, we got a little bit of feedback that it was too far and people weren't able to get nearly enough fish and after spending some time down there we agreed with them and decided to try out 100 yards as a closure this past I think that worked a lot better as far as summer. again allowing them to get fish, but not get too many fish.

 $\label{eq:madame} \mbox{MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:} \quad \mbox{Tyler, can I ask} \\ \mbox{a question before we move on to.....}$

MR. LAWSON: Sure.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:from this. We're talking subsistence fishers; is that correct?

MR. LAWSON: So for the -- this closure right here for the 500 to 100 yards, yes, that is for subsistence fishing with a gillnet that I'm referring to there.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And with the gillnet this is from people from Cold Bay and what is that daily take or what is the regulation on that for subsistence fish?

MR. LAWSON: Yeah. So this would be in State waters so any Alaskan resident who comes here can get that subsistence permit and then put out a gillnet or a seine to fish there. And as far as the limit for the Alaska Peninsula it is 250 salmon per household.

2

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's what I was after. And this is basically do you have numbers where the residency is coming from when -- on your numbers of what's harvested?

5 6

7

9

MR. LAWSON: Yeah, I don't have them here on me now. If we delved into some of our subsistence data I think I could parse out local residents versus nonlocal. We had some similar numbers in our area management report so it's something I could get for you later on if you're interested in seeing it.

11 12 13

14

15

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I would really -- I would appreciate that very much. I'll bring up my reason why later, but I think it's good information to have.

16 17 18

19

20

And before I ask any more questions I'm going to go ahead and ask the Council if they have any comments or questions for you in regard to what your report is for the Alaska Peninsula.

212223

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ LAWSON: And, Della, I just have three more points and then I'm done.

242526

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No, you're done.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

2728

(Laughter)

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

44

45

46 47 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Yeah, so the new Board of Fish proposals were brought up earlier. One of them is a proposal which is going to remove the link

of them is a proposal which is going to remove the link between noncommercial fishermen and subsistence users order to permanently open more waters for subsistence harvest. This is proposal 98. What this is getting at is specifically for Kinzarof Lagoon. When we have commercial fishing openers there's a closure there which includes subsistence users. a little bit complex and confusing to our subsistence users and they have to look at our commercial schedule or call me to see if there's an opening in order to know whether or not they can fish So the Department submitted this proposal to there. remove that link so that would only affect commercial fishing permit holders. So any subsistence user who is not a commercial fishing permit holder would not be affected, they have those areas open all the time. So

49 50

it would help to allow them more access throughout the duration of the salmon run.

2 3 4

At the last RAC meeting we offered up that we're happy to help anybody with drafting a regulation to submit to the State Board of Fish. We only had one individual take us up on that offer and they submitted proposal 103. So we just provided regulatory framework for them and that proposal which I think we'll discuss further and kind of read into the record essentially is looking to decrease the bag limit for sockeye and coho in Cold Bay waters from five fish per day to two fish per day.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: For sport?

MR. LAWSON: For sport fishing, yes. And also we worked with subsistence users from Unalaska to kind of read between some lines and some gray areas in regulations to allow them to use charter boats to transport them to areas that are very difficult if not hazardous to access in a small boat. So that allows them to hire a larger charger to get more members out to places such as McLees. So it will increase access and the ability for them to do fishing out there.

And then the last thing I have to say here, we also made it a priority to do these late surveys for this year which season escapement mentioned. So based on the feedback that we received from the RAC at the last couple of meetings we know that there's a lot of interest in knowing what's going on with these later sockeye run in Mortensen's and the coho in Russell and Trout. So I'm talking with my supervisor and now her supervisor, they have support for doing that, for keeping us out here even though it's a hit on our budget to keep us out here longer, to keep facilities open, to keep biologists and pilots out here. So I just want the RAC to know that our regional leadership supports everything that we're doing out here and they've heard what you have to say and they've given us support to do that, to try to answer the questions that you guys have for them.

If you're interested in those State proposals, I'm sure we'll talk about them later, but the Alaska Peninsula, Aleutian Islands and Chignik fin fish meeting, Board of Fish meeting is going to be February 20th and 25th. And if you want to submit

comments to that, whether it be as a RAC or as an individual, the comment due date is January 30th and you're welcome to reach out to us so we can let you know where those things are at, how to make those comments and the whole nine yards and we can kind of help you through that process. And that meeting will be in person in Anchorage if you would like to attend in person.

So that's it in a nutshell. Again I'll be here throughout all those FCRs and right now as well to take any questions that you happen to have. I tried to be kind of forthright with you about what we know and what we don't know and the resources we have and how we're stretched thin, but Fish and Game does have boots on the ground here and we have eyes in the sky and we have a long history of working with our subsistence users to take what they have to say to us. And as far as the government goes I think we're pretty quick and efficient at taking those things and trying to find remedies as quickly as we can to make it easier for them to put fish in their smokehouse and their freezer.

 $$\operatorname{And}$ if you have any other questions I'm happy to take them now.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you very much, Tyler. First of all I'd like to thank you for the great report. These -- I think it's unfortunate we didn't have these years ago. I think it would help us in many different aspects of this process.

Do the Council members have any questions before me getting started, I have.....

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Just a brief comment, Tyler. I think that's the best report we've ever gotten on fisheries and fisheries for this neck of the woods. It's excellent and it points out some of the touchy thing, particularly out in Unalaska as far as the vulnerability of these small systems and understanding potential impacts on them that could result from our chewing on things. And I think on your late season silver surveys I don't wonder if you're

short, I bet you could get Glenn Chen to volunteer because he's as passionate about silvers out here as anybody in the whole State. So he could be your man on the grounds.

(Laughter)

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MADAME}}$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Any other comments.

Rick, do you have any comments. Are you online.

MR. KOSO: Yes, Della, I do. Yeah

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

MR. KOSO: Tyler, I've got a question. I guess it's more -- a lot of it is a clarification too. I think last year you closed down the Swan Lake area although it was 500 yards, but you closed it down last year to subsistence fishing if I'm not mistaken and you left it open to rod and reel, sport fishing. But I understand that you also allowed rod and reel to harvest the subsistence fish. I guess I'm a little confused on this because I read here that I -- I always thought that this -- oh, the permit came from ADF&G, but I see here that, you know, the Department of Fish and Game and also the Feds issue subsistence -- the Subsistence Board issues also these permits. So I'm a little confused on that, maybe you can clarify that.

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. Yeah, Rick, there's a bit to unpack there so I'll kind of work through it here with you. So previously to go back a couple of years again we started to advise people in the community that you have to be 500 yards away from Swan Creek if you are engaged in subsistence. And that's again a regulation that was always there, we just didn't make it a point to point it out to people because the harvest down there was so low that it wasn't on our radar. For the reasons that I pointed out earlier in the presentation it was on our radar and it became a concern so we've been spending more time there and kind of grappling with this to try to dial it in, to try to find the right place to have it, for what you can and can't have. And that's to allow for the right amount of harvest without exploiting that run.

As far as the rod and reel, again we dialed it back this past year so that gillnets are allowed within 100 yards of the mouth of the creek. At the same time sport fishing via rod and reel is still allowed within 100 yards of that. I think there's some confusion and maybe a little bit of disagreement between the Department and some users about calling it a closure. We kind of view it as having a different type of gear type which is more liberal or not. So as a general principle for, you know, looking at salmon management as you head out in the ocean and you move your way towards a creek your salmon are going to get more condensed and it's easier to harvest them and So the farther away you are from that exploit them. mouth, the more liberal the gear type. So if you're farther away from the mouth in our eyes it's okay to have that gillnet which allows you to harvest a lot of fish relatively easily whereas if you have that gillnet right at the mouth you're going to harvest too many fish in a small system such as the Swan Creek one. Whereas if you have a rod and reel and you can only get five fish that's going to drastically reduce the impact that you can have on possibly overharvesting that.

I do want to say I think if we looked at who is fishing via rod and reel there is a mix there of out of state and out of town people who are coming in to visit for sport fishing and there's also quite a few what we call Federally-qualified user people from Cold Bay and there's a couple from King Cove as well who come over to snag there in the saltwaters. So there is kind of a mixture to kind of take into consideration as well when you're looking at subsistence there versus the rod and reel fishing which is occurring right there.

The State at this point we do not offer rod and reel subsistence in this region. I did offer at the last meeting that if somebody was interested in that we could help you to craft a proposal to the Board of Fish to do that, but as it stands right now the State in this region does not have rod and reel subsistence fishing.

So, Rick, does that answer all your questions there?

MR. KOSO: Yeah. Thank you, Tyler. That was very good and thanks again for your report, it

```
0092
    was really good.
 2
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Natasha, do you
 3
 4
    have any questions at this time.
 5
 6
                    (No comments)
 7
 8
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           So, Tyler, can
 9
    we go back to the 2013-2020
                                     subsistence sockeye
10
    harvested near Cold Bay.
11
12
                    MS. CHERNOFF:
                                   Della, can I just ask
13
    one short question in regards to what.....
14
15
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Go ahead.
16
    Go ahead, Coral.
17
18
                    MS. CHERNOFF:
                                   Thank you. So in this
19
    system when -- were you saying State subsistence was
20
    closed and rod and reel sport was open?
21
22
                    MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. So we
23
    would never term it as a closure for that system.
24
    there's just a certain yardage marker where that
    gillnet gear can and cannot be deployed and it has to
25
26
    be a certain distance away from the mouth. So we view
27
    it as the salmon of that Swan Lake system, they're
    still open subsistence, but your more liberal types
28
29
    have to be further away from the stream mouth.
30
    once you come inland near the mouth, you can't use a
31
    gillnet, but whether you're sport or -- sorry, if you
    are a sport user -- if you're subsistence you can also
32
33
    fish with a rod and reel near the mouth, but near the
34
    mouth you cannot fish with a gillnet. Does that make
35
    sense?
36
37
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Yes.
38
39
                    MR. LAWSON: Okay.
40
41
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           So that's the
    hundred feet and the 500 feet?
42
43
44
                    MR. LAWSON: Yards.
45
46
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yards.
47
    Okay. Any other questions.
48
49
                    MS. CHERNOFF: We....
```

0093 1 MR. PRICE: Madame Chair. 2 3 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Coral and 4 then.... 5 6 MR. KOSO: Della, one more quick 7 clarification if I might of Tyler. 8 9 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Go ahead, 10 Rick. And then Coral and then Chris. 11 12 MR. KOSO: Okay. Yeah, on the section 13 that says you may use a rod and reel to fish within the 14 sub -- within a subsistence fishing permit. 15 harvest limits applicable to the use of rod and reel take for subsistence use shall be as follows. It'll be 16 17 under the same statute or, you know, you got 250 fish 18 under the subsistence and you allowed rod and reel then 19 you're allowed to catch up to 250 fish with that as far 20 as I understand it with the subsistence permit. 21 Through the Chair. 22 MR. LAWSON: 23 Rick, I think you're looking at some of the Federal 24 regulations which apply specifically to Federal lands. 25 So that's something that I'd have to refer you to one 26 of the OSM biologists to explain in more detail. 27 manage the State subsistence fishing in the State 28 waters and in the State waters there is no subsistence 29 fishing for rod and reel. And historically in our 30 region there are no users who are following the Federal 31 regulations when it comes to subsistence salmon 32 fishing, all users in our region have historically 33 followed the State regulations for subsistence salmon 34 fishing. 35 36 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Coral. 37 38 MR. KOSO: Thanks for clearing that up. 39 I was just reading in the book there, it's quite confusing to me, but, you know, I'm not too sharp 40 41 either I guess. 42 43 So thanks again. 44 45 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Good question 46 though, Rick. Okay. 47 48 Coral, Chris, then Rebecca.

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah. So I wanted to clarify it could be opened -- Swan Lake can be open for -- it's a Federal subsistence qualifying area is what you're saying?

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. I am unsure of the jurisdiction there. I can tell you that most of the fishing occurs in saltwaters and that's definitely State waters. There is no fishing that's ever occurred that I'm aware of in the freshwaters there. Again that outlet is likely to have two inches of water so, I mean, you can literally run up and grab by hand if you want to go down there when the high tide is, and that lake is not feasible to get into fish based on the morphology and the surrounding area there.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris.

MR. PRICE: Thanks, Tyler.

MR. KOSO: What's that?

MR. PRICE. Thanks, Tyler, for your report. And I do want to thank you for helping us out in Unalaska with the -- just helping communicate and working with the tribe and the local community to solve some of our problems that we have with a very challenging fishery. And so we appreciate that very much. We know that the issues we've talked about with enforcement and with, you know, the local Fish and Game office are things that we want to continue to work on and try to come up with real good solutions for the And I did want to thank you again for community. working the charter issue to allow boats or people to get out to the location that might not otherwise be able to without a bigger boat. So that was an excellent opportunity to work with Fish and Game solve that local problem. Unfortunately we just didn't have too many fishing opportunities last summer to take advantage of that, maybe next year we can do that.

And also I wanted to just bring up that our local Fish and Game Advisory Board is getting ready to start back up. It would be nice if you could have some input with those folks when we do get started back up.

So thank you for your report.

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. Thank you, Chris, and I'm always happy to be at the AC meetings when you have them. So hopefully you guys can get a quorum and get some stuff going, but I definitely plan on being there.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, and I think we're just looking for absolutely clarification that Swan Lake which is what you were just talking about is State, there's no Federal jurisdiction there whatsoever? And I -- now I'm looking behind you at the Federal people.

MR. LAWSON: Yeah. So again I can tell you that in the saltwaters that's where all the fishing occurs and those are State waters. If you want to look at those freshwaters in the lake I think that's Refuge land, but I would defer that to OSM here, Izembek or somebody else to confirm who has jurisdiction. And I think even still there's some questions between the State and the Federal government about jurisdiction. I know -- if Mark Burch or Ben Mulligan knows anything, I know they've been working on that a little bit more and they might be able to chime in about some of the jurisdictional questions....

MS. SKINNER: Okay.

MR. LAWSON:in the region.

MS. SKINNER: All right. So just to chime in, I don't want to get in to the jurisdictional argument, I just want to make sure that Swan Lake is not something we're talking about today for either closure reviews or regulatory proposals on the Federal side.

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. There is no FCR for Swan Lake. I only mentioned it because now it is the most important subsistence system for the area.

MS. SKINNER: Okay. Thank you.

48 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: State?

0096 1 MR. LAWSON: State subsistence, 2 correct. 4 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Pat. 5 6 Point of clarification. MR. HOLMES: 7 You were talking about Nurse Lagoon before we went back to Swan Lake and I believe that OSM and correct me folks, has backed off on that on Nurse Lagoon and 9 10 Afognak Island with the exception of the Afognak Refuge 11 that exists there. But the Native lands and such 12 around there, they've kind of let it go for now. So I just want to clarify that Nurse Lagoon wasn't in that 13 14 discussion I believe, but I don't know. 15 16 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. 17 is Justin Koller for the record, OSM. I was just 18 looking for an answer to the Swan Lake question. If 19 you could repeat your question I can answer it for you. 20 Thank you. 21 22 23 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry. I just had heard that the -- you folks had backed off on Federal 24 jurisdiction for the lands around -- waters around 25 26 Afognak Island with the exception of what is part of 27 the Kodiak Refuge on the northwest side and that you no longer -- that Nurse Lagoon is State turf. I know I 28 29 need some clarification. 30 31 MR. KOLLER: Yeah. Through the Chair. 32 Once again this is Justin Koller with OSM. The issue of Nurse Lagoon, yes. It turns out that it is not 33 34 under Federal jurisdiction as of about 2005 or 2006 35 Secretary of Agriculture and when the Interior determined that. So yes, we are -- there is no Federal 36 37 jurisdiction in Nurse Lagoon. 38 39 MR. HOLMES: Thank you for that 40 clarification. 41 42 MR. KOLLER: You're welcome. 43 44 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Did you have any 45 comments prior to Pat's questions?

MR. KOLLER:

was thinking about the Swan Lake question. And I....

Yeah, thank you.

I just

46

47

48

MS. CHERNOFF: Can we bring up the maps of the Swan Lake area because I guess now I'm confused about where that 100 yards/500 yards is while we're talking about it.

MR. KOLLER: So while we get the map up, I believe Swan Lake proper is within the exterior boundaries of the Refuge in which case Federal regulations would apply. The closure area that Tyler referred to is in the marine waters directly around the mouth of Swan Lake.

MS. CHERNOFF: And that's Federal?

MR. KOLLER: That is State.

MS. CHERNOFF: State.

MR. KOLLER: That would be considered Cold Bay. Yeah, that would be considered Cold Bay and that's Federal or State jurisdiction.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And I don't think we have any Federal fisheries, most all is under State regulation, subsistence regulations.

MR. LAWSON: So through the Chair. If you're listening at home we have a map back up of Cold Bay and we're looking towards the northwest corner. And so you see Blinn Lake on the map there or (indiscernible - distortion) which is 284-34.03, kind of just a little bit up from that, hard to see on this map, but there's that little lake just to the right of Blinn Lake and that would be Swan Lake and where it empties out into there would be where all the fishing is occurring and that is where now those 100 yard as a closure for markers are up subsistence gillnetting. So outside of 100 yards you can gillnet, and within 100 yards of that mouth you cannot gillnet for salmon.

MR. PRICE: Can they point to it on the

 map?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Can you point -- somebody, yeah, point it up on the map.

So, Tyler, based on your report and going into various systems on the escapement and

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

21 22

23

24

harvest levels and I'm getting a sense over the last couple of years and, Rick, you can correct me if I'm reading any of this wrong, and I get this also from being the CEO for King Cove Corporation a lot of requests for people and/or sports guide to go on King Cove Corporation lands more so and able to harvest -people there -- their people to be able to harvest their salmon then historically that they've been going And when I say this, I say this with a concern that we -- based on levels of escapement or the fish not being there, those populations are not being there, so I get a sense people are moving around. And more -and you just kind of gave a good example of the fact that there's more pressure on Swan lake at this point. When I go back and I look, I take that into consideration and then I go back and look at your chart that you presented that showed -- I wish there were page numbers on this, I'll find it. Oh, right here. 19 There's the one that says the 2013-2020 subsistence sockeye harvested near Cold Bay. Under the 2020 in the blue, north Cold Bay total, how high that graph shows and when I question how much of this is -- is this all subsistence users and where are those subsistence users coming from when I know a population of Cold Bay is 40 to 60 people.

25 26 27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. And at looking at this 2013 to 2020 home again we're subsistence sockeye harvested near Cold Bay chart. This is all subsistence catch that is being reported right here. And so this is all Alaskan residents who have subsistence permits to catch these fish. And to kind of go with that, you know, you requested before about knowing about local users versus nonlocal and I said that was something I could maybe look up for you. I don't have it at this time. I think you also kind of included the sport fishing via rod and reel, the -- in your question. That's partially shown on the following slide here. And again at Swan Lake we don't have like a real survey or anything, but it's a mix of local users and a few kind of out of state people who are with guides that go down there. And, you know, also kind of for an anecdote here that the people that are usually most successful with actually fishing down there are the local people. I've watched people from the lower 48 come up to stand down there and there's more an art to it than you would think and they're not always as successful. Other times when there might be four people who go down and all get their bag limit of

five absolutely, but are there times when they go down there and get zero or one or two, yeah, and it's probably somewhere in between most of the time. So.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So when you're looking at this graph in the 2020 and you look at the -- technically the number harvested and you're looking to about close to 2,500 fish; is that correct?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Let me explain to you why I'm asking this. It isn't anything -- well, I'll be honest. I'm -- I can tell you I always tell people I'm upfront and honest, if I'm wrong, correct me. But I will also tell you that I hear from people from King Covea lot that there's adifference between -- I know I can get a permit for 250 fish as a resident of King Cove for subsistence and I actually have a couple of times in my lifetime. But I also -- and then you -- if you get -- if you live in Cold Bay as a resident you can have -- is it a take of 50 fish per day, what is the regulation if you're a resident of Cold Bay?

MR. LAWSON: Through the Chair. The default regulation for all of the Alaska Peninsula is 250. You might be referring to Mortensen's Lagoon and that specifically has a limit of 50 for that system.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: For anybody or just....

MR. LAWSON: For subsistence there's a limit of 50 per household for Mortensen's Lagoon.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So if I'm from King Cove and I need to be clear, I can come over here and go to Mortensen's and I can get 50 fish?

MR. LAWSON: Correct.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And the reason I bring that up, Tyler, is I've been told in the past by people that came over here to do that, they weren't allowed. And so I'm going to put pressure on you with the fact that the next time you come to King Cove to do your scales please call me because I'm dragging you to

the boat harbor and to people and we're going to $\ --\ I$ really want them to tell you what they perceived so you'd know and then I $\ --$ you know, at some point it would be nice to $\ --$ if there is an issue then it gets clarified or if there's a misunderstanding that we know what that is.

But above and beyond that I concerned when you look at these various places that people have been getting fish in and some of the fish not really being there as it has in the past which is probably going on in a lot more places than here. And then how, you know, we watch that and make sure that there isn't an overharvesting issue so we don't have a problem because that's when we get into the user And trust me I've been in the user conflict issue. conflict issue as the Chair on the Board between Kodiak on the goats and sports and subsistence. And it's not-it can not be a good thing to have to go through. It's -- people do have strong feelings about what they're doing, rightfully so, but it's just -- I just hate to see us get into that situation.

MR. LAWSON: Yeah, through the Chair to address a couple of your things. I know at Mortensen's we do have some of those closures and things of that nature. Maybe that's what some of the people at King Cove are referring to. So I think there's some things that we can look at, I mean, it's right on the back of their permit for those Mortensen's regulations that we're talking about and we can look at that later and I can kind of talk you through it and, I mean, if anybody's telling them they can't fish there, I mean, it would be me or my predecessor, I've never told anybody from King Cove they can't fish there. So I just encourage you to have them call the office or stop by and it's my job to talk to them, I'm happy to do that to kind of -- to kind of clarify that.

And with your other point talking about the harvest year and kind of the local versus nonlocal. You know, again we do have it kind of ciphered out and I can look at it again later, but for the people that are coming from out of town I just want to point out that a lot of them are close relatives or close friends with people who do live here and a lot of them are people who maybe lived here for 10 or 20 years and then moved away. So just kind of something to keep in mind as well for some of those people that are coming up

0101 here to do some of their harvesting, they're the friends and family of people who've lived here a long time, I know it's not the same as being a local user, but for some of the people here it's important that 5 their friends and family are able to get some of that 6 take as well. 7 8 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And that 9 basically refers to Alaska residents from the 10 State.... 11 12 MR. LAWSON: Correct. 13 14 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:the whole 15 State? 16 17 MR. LAWSON: Yeah. 18 19 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: See I think 20 that's not really clear to people. I think I'll 21 probably have more questions for you as we go through, 22 but I'll let you get off the hot seat for a little bit 23 here. But thank you very much for this report, it's 24 very beneficial. 25 26 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. 27 28 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So we'll kind of 29 move on to preliminary subsistence harvest data for 30 Kodiak. 31 32 Jackie Keating. 33 34 MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Madame 35 Chair. Can everybody hear me okay? 36 37 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Loud and clear. 38 39 MS. KEATING: Fantastic. Well, again for the record my name is Jackie Keating, I'm the 40 41 research lead for the Division of Subsistence, 42 Southcentral Region, Anchorage and Kodiak. I'm here today to present the preliminary findings for the 44 comprehensive household harvest surveys that conducted between February and April of 2022 for the 45

2021 harvest year. And if you're following along

online this presentation can be found in tab two of

your supplemental materials.

46 47

48

I first want to acknowledge our project partners. This work was funded by the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and it's a collaboration with the Sun'aq Tribe of Kodiak and Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. So Mat Van Daele and Mike Brady and Amy Peterson among others were incredibly helpful in helping us pull this off, a project of this size still navigating the pandemic last year so a big thanks to all of them.

9 10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33 34

6

7

8

Also I want to emphasize that these are preliminary findings. As most of you know this research updated comprehensive harvest data for the Kodiak road system for the first time since 1993 and for Kodiak Station it was 1991. So because this fills a 30 year data gap we expedited the analysis of these data, we conducted a preliminary internal data review and then we shared the draft findings with our partners at the Sun'ag Tribe and it's with the Tribe's permission that we're sharing these draft findings today as they pertain to Fisheries Proposal 23-05a which would modify the customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak area to include residents of Kodiak Coast -- Coast Guard base in Kodiak. So again because these are preliminary data there may be some minor changes in the final report, but we do not anticipate anything substantial to change. And lastly before I get into it I do just want to share that we will be conducting the full public community data review meeting in Kodiak at the Kodiak Refuge Visitor's Center on Thursday, November 3rd, 6:30 p.m. And after that point when all the data is finalized and approved I'd be happy to give a full presentation at your next winter meeting if that would be beneficial.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

At this point we can move to slide So there's a lot of information in this number 2. table. It shows a sample achievement and I just wanted to highlight a couple different things. So for these surveys we used a geographically restratified sample and it's divided the road system into the Kodiak city and census designated place or CDP. The second category means road connected areas so that's everything from Nanoshka and out to Chiniak and And third the Kodiak Station census Bathesha. designated place. This includes residences both on and off base. In total we completed 269 comprehensive harvest surveys which is an enormous amount and we

couldn't have done it without the amazing local research assistants that were working with us. And you can see for Kodiak Station in the household survey one that we exceeded our minimum sampling goal for Kodiak Station. The goal was 30 households, we got 31. And out of those about a third were off base housing in the Lake Louise or Aviation Loop areas that are still Coast Guard housing just off base. The remaining two-thirds were households that were actually on base.

And when we look down at the next highlighted line, those are our refusal rates. So those are households that we contact and make contact with, but then they decline to participate in the survey. And Kodiak Station was actually our lowest for refusal rates at 8.8 percent when we look at the whole road system so all three combined we have a refusal rate of 19.9 percent. And both of these are actually right in line with what we normally see across the State for these types of projects. In smaller communities we usually have about a 10 percent refusal rate and larger ones are right around 20. So this is actually quite normal.

If we could go to slide three. This slide shows a summary of population characteristics for Kodiak Station. Again lots of information that we highlighted a few things to talk about today. The average household side is 3.6 which is just slightly higher than the other two stratas for the Kodiak city and the road system, they're all hovering right around three.

There are a couple defining characteristics of the Kodiak Coast Guard population compared to the other road connected areas. The first one to point out is that the average age is 21, that's significantly lower than the city which is 38 and the road system average is 37. And this makes a whole lot of sense when you look at the maximum age in the Coast Guard sample is 47 and again it just makes sense because of the age of active serving members living in the U.S. Coast Guard housing on base.

The other defining characteristics is the average total length of residency. So we asked folks the total amount of years they lived in Kodiak combined even if they moved away and they came back. For Kodiak Station that's 2.9 years, when we look at

Kodiak city it was about 20 years on the road system, remaining road was about 22. Again this makes sense because people are in and out.

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12

2

And then finally the other thing to highlight here is the percent of Alaska Natives for Kodiak Station was 0 percent. This is consistent with what we saw in the 1991 survey of Kodiak Station. I do want to point out this doesn't mean that there's no Alaska Natives that are serving in the Coast Guard and living on base. There may be some, but it's a small number and we just didn't capture them in this particular study.

13 14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

And we're on to slide four. This slide shows the percentage of Kodiak Station households using each different resource category that we asked about in comprehensive surveys. So resource use is in blue. The light orange is for the percentage of households attempting to harvest a resource category and then the dark orange is the percentage actually harvested. And if we look at salmon, that's the one all the way on the left side there, it's 87 percent of the households used salmon, 81 percent attempted to harvest it and then 71 percent of the households actually harvested salmon in the 2021 study year. And then you can also see the difference between the percentage of households attempting to harvest and then actually harvesting, the biggest difference of the three stratas was for Kodiak Station, a 10 percent difference. And this makes sense because those people are likely Native fishing, but also are likely relying primarily on rod and reel So that discrepancy is pretty normal. harvest. thing that was a bit surprising for us was to not see any marine invertebrates use for harvest for members of Kodiak Station. In 1991 65 percent of the households used. This could be attributed to a number of factors, it could be local declines, it could be concerns with PSP or simply just didn't capture the households that used that particular resource category. And the last thing to point out here is vegetation is second to salmon in the percentage of households using and again this makes a whole lot of sense because it's accessible for folks and a lot of people are able to harvest herring and things like that even if they're not active fisher -- fisherman or hunters and things like that.

46 47 48

And then I'll move on to slide number 5. Slide five shows resource harvest and use

characteristics for Kodiak Station. And again I'll present a couple things to point out. In that first line we're looking at the average number of resources used. So this is different types of resources. For Kodiak Station it's 5.8 and again this is a little bit lower. In Kodiak city households use an average of 7 and a half different resources, for Kodiak road it was 7.3

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Jackie, can I interrupt you for a minute please, this is Della.

MS. KEATING: And if we.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm going to ask if you can maybe speak closer to the mic and a little more slowly.

Thank you.

MS. KEATING: Absolutely. I can -- does that come through any better for you?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes. Thank you.

MS. KEATING: We'll try -- yeah, you bet, we'll try with that. So reemphasizing that for the number of resources used per household is 5.8 for Kodiak Station and then when we look at the Kodiak city it's a bit higher at 7.5, the road 7.8. And for this slide if you look at the bottom of that section grouping that's the per capita harvest, the total pounds in usable weight. For Kodiak Station that is 46 pounds and this is lower than the city which was about 74 and a half pounds. And then the remaining connected road was a bit higher than that, it was 87 pounds. And the last thing to point out on this one is the percentage of households using any resource which is the second to last line there. The Kodiak Station was 100 percent of households. So that doesn't represent the volume of resources used, but it does show that using wild resources is something important to the residents of the Coast Guard Kodiak Station and a lot of people utilize some level of wild resources.

And on slide number 6, this is a pie chart and it shows the percentage of salmon harvest by species, again just for Kodiak Station households. When we look at the total harvest we're just above

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

28,000 pounds and if you break it down per person it's about 20 pounds of salmon per person for Kodiak Station. Just for comparison in 1991 it was a bit more at 30 pounds of salmon per household for Kodiak And then going back to this study year, so Station. 2021, when we compare that to other road system residents, for the city they harvested a little over 33 pounds per person and the remaining road was right about 30 pounds per person for salmon. And you'll notice that the composition for the Kodiak Station residents as you see coho makes up makes up over half of the salmon harvest usable weight which varies from Kodiak city and the road connected where sockeye salmon make up a much greater percentage of the total harvest. The other primary difference you see in looking at Kodiak Station is the ratio of pink salmon. It is significantly higher at 16 percent of the salmon harvest compared to 3 and 4 percent for Kodiak city and road respectively. And again this makes sense just due to access to these zones and the fact that a lot of Coast Guard families that we talked to were new to the area, new to fishing so harvesting pink salmon is maybe a bit more accessible and something that they can participate in.

242526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 49

50

Then if we could move to the final slide, that's slide number 7. This is a figure that shows the percentage of households using, attempting to harvest, harvesting, receiving and giving away salmon. And this figure actually looks at all three stratas so we see the Kodiak city strata in blue, the remaining road connected area is orange and Kodiak Station is yellow. Again this is not an expression of the volume of salmon harvested, but you can see for the percent of households using salmon, Kodiak Station is right with the (indiscernible - distortion) by Kodiak residents and household with over 80 percent of household using salmon. And when it comes to harvesting salmon Kodiak Station actually has the highest percentage households harvesting, that's that middle bar, and like 71 percent of households that were harvesting salmon. So again this doesn't express volume, it could be related to families trying the fish for the first time and just getting out there and harvesting a handful of In other main (indiscernible - distortion) fish. distance here is the percentage of households giving salmon away. That's the column all the way on the right. The lowest is the Kodiak Station so that's less than 20 percent of households are actually giving fish

```
0107
    away and again this could be related to possibly only
     catching one or two fish. So the (indiscernible -
    distortion) actively giving that particular resource
 4
    away to other households.
 5
 6
                    So that's what we have for today and
 7
     again I would just like to reiterate that these are the
     draft tables and they will be finalized after the full
 8
 9
     community data review in November, but I will be here
10
    through the duration of the meeting and I'm also happy
11
    to answer any questions.
12
13
                    Thank you, Madame Chair.
14
15
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                               Thank you,
16
     Jackie.
              Just so you know it's almost like someone
17
    waving the mic as you're talking and so you're like
18
     almost coming in and going out, but we did hear you.
19
20
                    So does anybody have any questions for
21
    Jackie.
22
23
                    (No comments)
24
25
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            I -- doesn't
26
    appear to be any questions, Jackie, so I guess we can
27
    continue to move on.
28
29
                    Thank you very much for your report.
30
31
                    MS. KEATING: Thank you.
32
33
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                            Let's take a
34
    five, 10 minute break so they can switch here. We're
35
    going to move on to the regional fishery proposal and
    closure reviews.
                        And we'll start with the Kodiak
36
37
    region.
38
39
                    And before we do that however,
40
     apologize. Jeff Wasley, we can have you not -- maybe
41
    when we get back from a break we'll go ahead and have
42
    you speak to your request.
43
44
                    MR. WASLEY: Thank you.
45
46
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                               Thank you.
47
     Sorry. I'm....
48
```

(Off record)

49

(On record)

 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:we can resume the meeting. Okay. Everybody, it's 3:00 o'clock we probably need to try and move on here. It's -- and, Glenn, we may have to come back after dinner because we are -- technically haven't made a dent in this agenda.

Okay. So the next item on the agenda, we do have a person requesting to speak and that's Jeff Wasley. I know he was just here.

MR. WALLEY: Yeah, hi, Madame Chair. This is Jeff Walley. I -- actually I didn't have a request to speak. I don't know, maybe -- I know there was another Jeff online.

(Laughter)

 $\label{eq:madame} \mbox{MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:} \quad \mbox{Oh, it's Jeff} \\ \mbox{Wasley.} \quad \mbox{I'm sorry.}$

MR. WALLEY: Okay.

MR. WASLEY: Okay. Thank you guys for coming to Cold Bay and thanks for the chance to speak. I'll try to make it real brief. I have been in Cold Bay for about 20 years, local resident, business owner. I do guided sport fishing and guided duck and goose hunts.

I'm most interested in the proposal to reduce the sockeye and coho limits. I personally believe that the coho and sockeye should be managed They're a separate resource and in my separately. opinion we have pretty strong silver runs in Russell Creek, Trout, Mortensen's, Frosty Creek and other smaller creeks and lakes where the sockeye I think in 2017 or 2018 crashed kind of in Mortensen's and now we have a concern about that. And the overfishing in Swan Lake which I guess looking at that chart it showed just a subsistence take of 2,000 to 2,500. And, you know, looking at the household limit of 250 that could just be 10 houses here in Cold Bay. And I think it's definitely a concern and I don't know if that's sustainable to keep it at 250 per household on that little system, I don't know. But from a sport fishing standpoint we don't really target the sockeye, most

people want to catch silvers and we fished one time on Swan Lake this year and that's it, you know. So I just kind of want to let folks know that the sport fishing and sport guided hunting are important to this community, there's several businesses that are just that and the other businesses rely on us, the airlines, the store, et cetera. So that's it on fishing.

I've read through some minutes of other meetings and I've read about concerns of the hunting client use day increase on Izembek. And I'd just like to point out that some of that is due to more people getting permits, but also myself and another permit holder, we do a lot of hunting in October, November and December when most local hunters are done. And we try to avoid conflict as much as we can. And like Della mentioned earlier, I think that if we can avoid conflict andwork together Ithink it's bestfor everyone.

So that's all I got.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Jeff. Will you just hold up in case anybody has any questions.

MR. WASLEY: Sure.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And when you're done you can just go ahead and turn off your mic.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca. Go ahead and turn your mic off, Jeff.

 MS. SKINNER: Great. Thank you. I appreciate that you came to the meeting and gave comment. I think we don't hear a lot directly from the sport and sport users. I did want to ask a couple of clarifying questions. The proposal you are commenting on, that was the Board of Fish Proposal 103, is that the one you were commenting on?

MR. WASLEY: I'm sorry, I don't know it off the top of my head what number it is. The one to reduce the.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Bag limit.

0110 1 MR. WASLEY:from five a day and 2 no possession to two a day and two in possession. 4 MS. SKINNER: Okay. And then I just 5 want to be clear, you did not agree with reducing those 6 limits; is that correct? 7 8 MR. WASLEY: I would not agree with the 9 lowering of the limit on the silvers. The sockeye, I 10 think I'd leave that up to whoever is in charge. But I 11 don't believe the silvers have nearly the amount of pressure that most systems have since we have four or 12 13 five different systems that are -- some are barely 14 fished at all. 15 16 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Other questions. 17 18 MR. PRICE: Madame Chair. 19 20 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris. 21 22 MR. PRICE: So you mentioned that the 23 subsistence total was 2,500, what.... 24 25 MR. HOLMES: Two hundred and fifty. 26 27 MR. PRICE: Well, per household and 2,500 for the year. Is that -- was the number? 28 29 30 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, he 31 250 per household, 2,500 for the year. 32 33 MR. PRICE: Right. And you're a sport 34 fishing guide. Why are you -- do you see a lot of the 35 people come in from outside to fish the subsistence, I 36 mean, what are you seeing? 37 38 MR. WASLEY: I -- most people that come in that want to sport fish want to fish for silvers. 39 40 Certainly some do fish for sockeye here and there, but 41 none of it would be with net, it's all hook and line so 42 at most they're going to take five sockeye, you know, a day, but like we've done it one day this season and we 43 44 fished for silvers almost every other day. So it's just they don't really want to snag fish, they want to 45 46 catch them. And it's just also like I don't want to be

in conflict with my local friends and like it's just

not a good look for a business owner to take out of

state people up there day after day snagging limits of

47

48

49

sockeye. So obviously it's a limited resource and it's important for the locals. So there's a lot more silvers than sockeye so we just choose to do that, you know.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Thanks for your comments there, that's very informative. I don't know that we're dealing particularly with that proposal, but we have gotten a fair amount of comments from long term local folks that they feel that there's too much competition and I think on silvers with folks that are coming into town from other places and I don't know how we're going to address that or whatever. But do you have any possible thoughts of solutions on that to where local folks wouldn't need to seek other reductions or changes, to where folks could kind of -- I don't know, hard to share a fishing hole I know, but just wanted to see if you might have some thoughts on how to make it work without changing regulation.

MR. WASLEY: I guess I really don't have any good answer to that. It's -- you know, it's a public resource and people are going to want to come and fish in Alaska. It's -- a lot of people want to do that and I would like to remind Alaskans that a lot of people leave this State to go do stuff in other States and that's just kind of how it works. So reducing -you know, you could reduce the limit, they're still going to come fish like -- it's not going to reduce the I don't know -- I don't know if there is competition. a solution where you're going to have the creek like it was 30 years ago or something how they remember it. There's always going to be fishermen. In 20 years I've seen maybe there's more sport fishing now, but there's always been sport fishing.

MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Della. Yeah, I just want to say thank you for coming in and speaking on this. Can you tell me how many -- like what is your

fishing season and what's the maximum amount of clients?

MR. WASLEY: So we would start in the end of August and go through the end of September and we may not fish that much towards the end of September depending on the run. We could have up to eight, nine people in camp, sometimes five or six.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So, Jeff, maybe -- first of all yes, thanks for coming forward. I lost my train of thought. You -- so you said maybe eight, so that's five to eight people a day, is that what you're referring to as far as taking people out fishing?

MR. WASLEY: Yeah. And that would be the max. We get some groups that don't care about fishing at all and they might go one morning. So it's really — to put an average on it, it's really hard to do. Some groups are really focused on the hunting, some people want to fish a lot more. But we're definitely more focused on hunting. I don't do just fishing only. So.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So looking back I think in the crash of technically the reds a few years ago and then now, you know, I know silver fishing over here has always been a big thing because I've done it on Russell myself, I love to do it. What are you seeing, I know we saw a lot less silvers this year compared — if you compared it to last year there was a tremendous amount of silvers. And we were fishing silvers up into the end of November and they were there. Right now they're hardly around there, there's not that many silvers. What are you basically seeing here?

MR. WASLEY: I would say yeah, last year was phenomenal. This year it seemed they started a little late and then there was a lot of them and now they're still -- those fish are in the river, but they're tough to catch because they've been here for a while and we're hoping to get some more fresh ones showing up, but if that happens I don't know when and how many. But it's a little down from last year I would say, but still we had some really good weeks for fishing.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And then given you -- you mentioned you've been here for the last 20 years and what -- when you see from basically the last 10 years in looking at the various salmon species and fishing and I feel like people are looking for other areas now. And like I said we mentioned early in some degree the concern of possibly the resources starting to not necessarily be there in the numbers they used to and people are people are going to other areas. Do you feel like that's what's going on here in Cold Bay?

MR. WASLEY: Yeah, again with Mortensen's used to be like the place to go get sockeye and now it's really worth even going down there. haven't been down there for years. But, you know, people are going to get their fish so it's really easy like Tyler had said, you know, it's very easy for people to get fish at Swan Lake and there was a lot of them there this year. And I think people are going to get their fish. So it -- that pressure I think is only going to get more on Swan Lake if Mortensen's doesn't come back.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And I think maybe -- just so you understand from my perspective on this and the concern is, you know, that pressure being there and what the impact of that will be in the future as we go through these various systems and looking at the lack of fish that aren't so much there anymore that have been in the past. And that's kind of where -- from my perspective I come from because it is a concern when you live out here year round and, you know, I don't how much -- if you're year round here in Cold Bay, but just on the resources and working together to maintain a renewable resource so that we're all able to use it. And that's basically where I come from.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Thanks. I just had a follow-up question on -- relating to the level of your business. So I understand you said it's hard to average, but you indicated you might get eight to nine people at camp which I'm interpreting like eight a trip, so eight or nine people come in together. For this year, it's almost the end of September, so in the

last month how many camps did you have, was it like five camps or four camps or....

 MR. WASLEY: So we started the last week of August, like the transition week into September and like next week we'll probably fish a little, if there isn't more silvers showing up we'll probably just focus on hunting and other things.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: This is Della again. I -- and this kind of -- we asked this of Fish and Wildlife or Izembek I believe last year and maybe the year before on the number of permits that are given out to guides. And then I think at one point we were told that there were four permits, but under those permits there are subpermits that are -- people are utilizing under that main permit. So I -- how many -- what, you're guiding under one permit from Fish and Wildlife or are you a subpermittee under somebody else's permit?

MR. WASLEY: I've always had my own permit and I get a permit for fishing, guided waterfowl hunting and filming. So there's three permits, but they're all in my name and we don't have anyone sub under us.

MS. FOSADO: Madame Chair, members of the Council, maybe I can provide a little bit of clarity. The permit is issued to Jeff Wasley and --for flyaways, but he has guides. So he's not the only guide, he has guides listed on his permit. So that might be where the subcontractor confusion is coming in.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So -- excuse me, Maria, would you please state your name.

Thank you.

41 MS. FOSADO: I'm sorry. Yes, I'm Maria 42 Fosado.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So Izembek has how many permits that they've given out at this -- each year for the last couple years?

48 MS. FOSADO: Madame Chair, members of 49 the Council. Specifically for sport fishing we have

five fishing permits. And those permits are for conducting sport fishing on Refuge lands. So it -- one of the stipulations to those permits is that they have to report client use days at the end of the season. Those client use days are only days which sport fishing occurred on Refuge land. So they don't report out on Russell Creek or State land or any other area. So that's client use days specific to activities that occurred on Refuge lands.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. So that's part of it, Jeff, because I get -- sometimes hear from people locally that there's been a lot more sport hunter use. And just understand I bring this forward because people bring it to me and it's my job to put that out there, you know, and how we try to figure out if there's misconceptions and I'd like to know if there are so I can let people know. But yeah, I appreciate....

MS. HAYDEN: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

 MS. HAYDEN: Sorry. This is Natasha. I -- Rebecca or Council member Skinner had asked a question about the number of parties, the number of groups and I did not -- I wasn't able to hear the answer to that. I did hear I think he said the season begins the end of August. If you could just get him to reiterate the response would be helpful.

MR. WASLEY: For fishing it would be the end of August through the end of September. So and our people show up on the weekend and we switch out every Saturday so five groups.

MS. HAYDEN: Thank you for that. So that's five groups at nine participants per group; is that correct?

MR. WASLEY: Some were four, some were nine, some were eight. So I'd say an average of seven.

MS. HAYDEN: Great. And I've got a quick follow-up. They're targeting silver salmon and currently the limit is five, the bag limit is five per person per day, is that also -- do I understand that correctly?

0116 1 MR. WASLEY: That is correct. 2 3 MS. HAYDEN: Okay. Thank you. 4 5 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. 6 any -- Chris. 7 8 MR. PRICE: On those bag limits, do you 9 think you're going to keep those sustainable over time 10 like five fish per day per client, probably catch and 11 release or not everybody even wants fish, but are you 12 -- is that -- is everybody trying to get five fish a 13 day in their coolers or how's it going for you guys on 14 the.... 15 16 MR. WASLEY: Cooler space is kind of an 17 issue and getting this stuff home. So a lot of people 18 if they get a cooler full of fish and birds that's 19 So with silvers you're probably looking at 20 five pounds roughly each of meat with the two filets. 21 So most guys are taking home -- or gals, they're taking 22 four to six fish in a week and, you know, we will catch 23 and release. There are some that will want to take two 24 coolers of fish, but it's rare and there's some that 25 won't take any. So we're not out to limit five fish 26 every day. 27 28 MR. PRICE: Okay. Thank you. 29 30 MR. WASLEY: Thank you. 31 32 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And to add to Jeff's comments, you're lucky to get a cooler out of 33 34 here and get it -- catch your flight going to the lower 35 48 because trust me, you're lucky to get your suitcase. 36 So.... 37 38 Any other questions for Jeff? 39 40 (No comments) 41 42 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you very 43 much for taking the time, appreciate it. And it helps 44 us as we go through this process. 45 46 MR. WASLEY: Thank you, too. 47 48 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And as -- just 49 to reiterate if anybody has any public comments, if 50

you're online or -- you're more than welcome to let us know and we will work with our schedule -- agenda to allow you to speak.

4 5

6

All right. It is now 25 after 3:00 and we are going to start on 11B, regional fisheries proposals and closure reviews.

7 8 9

10

11

12

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: So we're going to be taking up FP 28-05a. It starts on page 27 of your Council books. And we're going to have Justin Koller, Jarred Stone and also Jason Roberts reporting. So we'll let you take over.

13 14

Thanks.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

29 30

31

MR. KOLLER: Yeah. Thank you, Madame Chair, members of the Council. My name's Justin Koller. I am a Fisheries Biologist at the Office of During the fall of even Subsistence Management. numbered years the Regional Advisory Councils review analyses of fisheries regulatory proposals and closure reviews and make recommendations to the Board on Subsistence each item. The Federal Subsistence Board will act on these proposals and closure reviews during their January, 2023 regulatory meeting. This region has four fisheries proposals and 14 closure reviews which we will be presenting to you at this meeting. That'll be Jason Roberts is first up, then Jarred Stone and then me, Justin Koller, will be reporting out and presenting the Unalaska and Alaska Peninsula and Cold Bay closure reviews.

32 33 34

35

36 37

38 39

40

I wanted to remind those in attendance in person or on the phone that there will be an opportunity for oral public testimony on each item after presentation of the analysis. Those in person wishing to make comments must fill out a comment card and submit it to the Council Coordinator or a Staff member. Written comments will be accepted up until the beginning of the presentation of each analysis.

41 42 43

44

Thank you, Madame Chair, and does the Council have any questions before we begin the Staff analysis?

45 46 47

(No comments)

48 49

MR. KOLLER: Okay. Then I'll hand it

over to Jason Roberts and that's for the Fisheries Proposal 23-05a.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Hello, Madame Chair, members of the Council. I'm Jason Roberts, I'm a Cultural Anthropologist for OSM and I'll be giving a slightly summarized version of the analysis for Fisheries Proposal 23-05a. This analysis begins on page 27 of your meeting books and this is an action item.

So FP 23-05a was submitted by the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. The proponents are requesting to add residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base to the customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak area. The proponents are also requesting to change the area descriptors for the customary and traditional use determination zones within the Kodiak Islands to clarify the areas under regulation and reduce administrative complexity.

In their request the proponents of FP 23-05a note that it is inconsistent and unfair to Coast Guard base residents exclude Kodiak and traditional use salmon harvest customary opportunities in the Kodiak area because active duty Coast Guard service members live both on and off base here. Currently Kodiak Coast Guard service members who reside off base can become eligible for Federal subsistence salmon harvest opportunities while Coast Guard service members who reside on base cannot. proponents believe that members of the Coast Guard who meet the general eligibility requirements for Federal subsistence priority should not be excluded from the privileges granted to all other eligible rural residents of the Kodiak area. And it should also be noted just for consideration that in contrast to the situation surrounding Federal subsistence salmon existing customary and traditional harvest determinations for the harvest of wildlife do not make a distinction between residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base and the other residents of the Kodiak area.

And so for a brief discussion of the regulatory history involved, in 1988 the State of Alaska's Board of Fisheries met to determine the customary and traditional use salmon harvest status for resident of the Kodiak Management Area. At that time the State Board of Fisheries considered the existence

of multi-generational kinship relations between local subsistence users to be a key criterion for establishing customary and traditional use in a given area. This was one of the key reasons why the Coast Guard base was excluded from the customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak area at this time. The Board of Fisheries also noted during this initial determination that most of the population on the base was transient.

The Federal Subsistence Management Program assumed management of subsistence uses of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands in 1990. And the new Federal subsistence regulations incorporated many provisions from earlier State subsistence regulations. And so the customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak area was brought into Federal regulation in this manner incorporating the previously existing exclusion of Coast Guard base residence.

In 1997 Payton versus State of Alaska found that a lack of multi-generational kinship relations within a given area was not sufficient bases for denying customary and traditional use status to residents of that area. The court also found that a relatively short average length of residency for recent residents of the area should not necessarily preclude a customary and traditional use determination as long as there is evidence of ongoing customary use of the And so this ruling led to a resource through time. the customary and traditional change in determination for residents of the Yentna River area, but it does not appear that this ruling has been considered in relation to the status of residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base.

 And so FP 23-05a is the first proposal that specifically addresses the customary and traditional use status of the Kodiak Coast Guard base residents since this initial determination was made by the State in 1988 and then carried over into subsequent Federal subsistence regulations.

A 2010 wildlife regulatory decision in the eastern interior region may also have some relevance for deliberations on this proposal. In 2010 the Eastern Interior Regional Advisory Council submitted Wildlife Proposal 10-89 requesting to remove residents of Fort Greely from the customary and

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

traditional use determination for caribou in units 20D and 20E and for moose in unit 20D. The ERAC requested the removal of Fort Greely residents from these customary and traditional use determinations because they felt that the temporary nature of their residence at Fort Greely did not allow for the establishment of a long term consistent pattern of use. Subsistence Board in this case however did not adopt FP 10-89. The Board noted that removing residents of Fort Greely from the customary and traditional determinations for caribou and moose in these areas would be detrimental to the subsistence of the Federally-qualified rural residents stationed at Fort Greely and that there was a long history -- there was a history that had been documented of residents at Fort Greely engaging in subsistence practices in the areas under question.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

And so moving on to the next section about the eight factors for determining customary and traditional use. When conducting a customary and traditional use determination analysis eight factors are considered. And you can find these factors listed on page 36 of your meeting book. And please keep in mind that these factors are not used as a checklist. The Board makes customary and traditional use determinations based on a holistic application of these eight factors as well as the reports recommendations of appropriate Regional Advisory Councils. And the Board makes customary traditional use determinations for the sole purpose of recognizing the pool of users who generally exhibit the eight factors and not for resource management or for restricting harvest. If a conservation concern exists the Board addresses that concern through harvest limits, season restrictions or the section subsistence user prioritization process, not through customary and traditional use determinations.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48 49

50

So the Kodiak Coast Guard base as I'm sure you all know is located in the traditional territory of the Alutiiq. The base encompasses approximately 22,000 acres of land on the northeastern end of Kodiak Island. The area was originally developed in 1939 as a U.S. Navy base and Coast Guard service members have been resident here since the 1940s. The military installation was turned over to the Coast Guard in 1972. The documented subsistence survey information we have to go on is a bit spotty,

6 7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

but what we have currently available for Kodiak Coast Guard base residents shows a history of harvesting, using and sharing salmon taken from Kodiak fisheries that we can trace back to at least the early 1990s. This was the study that Jackie Keating mentioned a bit in her discussion earlier in this panel meeting. And I've got some more detailed tables with information on those studies and the larger analysis in your meeting Likewise Kodiak Coast Guard base residents also have a documented history of harvesting nonsalmon fish and seafood, deer and other wildlife and plants and berries for subsistence purposes. A study of the subsistence activities of Kodiak Island communities conducted by ADF&G in 1991 revealed that the salmon harvest use practices of the residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base compared relatively favorably with those of other residents of road connected communities on Kodiak Island, however Kodiak Coast Guard base 19 residents typically harvested and used significantly less salmon than communities located off the road And this trend has continued in the years system. where comparable data is available. The average Coast Guard household harvested 118 pounds of salmon during the 1991 study year. 97 percent of surveyed households reporting using salmon while 90 percent of households reported harvesting salmon. Approximately 55 percent of base households reported giving salmon to others while 45 percent reported receiving salmon. And so as Jackie Keating told you today, the average Coast Guard household reported harvesting about 166 pounds of salmon in 2021.

31 32 33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

Over time like I said the study data on Kodiak Coast Guard base households has been kind of spotty. And so in 1999 we have a report that said that Kodiak military households returned 43 subsistence permits for salmon, harvesting a total of 886 salmon. And again this harvest level per household was well below that reported for communities off the road system like Port Lions and Ouzinkie, but the average number of salmon harvested per military household was again similar to that reported for residents located along the road system like Kodiak city. This trend continued in 2001 when residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base returned 74 subsistence permits, harvesting a reported total of 1,346 salmon. And so unfortunately 2001 was the last time we had specific documented information on subsistence salmon harvests by Kodiak Coast Guard base residents up until the preliminary data we just heard

5

6 7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2223

Jackie Keating talk about earlier today. So that kind of limits my analysis, however it may also be worth nothing that Federal subsistence priority is intended to extend to any rural resident of Alaska under the framework of ANILCA. And according to the code of Federal regulations an Alaskan resident is defined as any person who has his or her primary permanent home for the previous 12 months within Alaska and whenever absent from this primary permanent home intention of returning to it. A person's residence is considered rural when it occurs in a community or area of Alaska determined by the Board to qualify as such. The Kodiak Island Borough is recognized as a rural area by the Board. Therefore many Kodiak Coast Guard base residents would meet the qualification for Federal subsistence priority if not for the current exception in the Kodiak area customary and traditional use determination noted for salmon. Kodiak Coast Guard service members who happen to reside off base can already qualify for Federal subsistence salmon harvest opportunities after achieving Alaskan residency status. And nearly half of the military provided housing units for active duty Coast Guard Service members in Kodiak and support personnel are technically located off base.

242526

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

So the effects of this proposal if the Board adopts this proposal, members of the U.S. Coast Guard stationed at Kodiak base would gain opportunity to harvest salmon under Federal subsistence management regulations on Federal public waters in the Kodiak area if they meet Alaskan residency requirements for Federal subsistence priority. If the Board does not adopt this proposal Coast Guard members residing on the Kodiak base will continue to be excluded from Federal subsistence salmon fisheries in the Kodiak Coast Guard members residing on base will area. continue to be able to harvest salmon in the Kodiak area according to the State of Alaska's subsistence or sport fishing regulations however.

39 40 41

42

43

44

45 46

47

48

And so OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support proposal FP 23-05a with a modification to the proposed customary and traditional use area descriptors as shown on page 39 of your meeting book. And so in that modification we basically changed what the Refuge had suggested as calling Kodiak area remainder to Kodiak mainland district just because we thought that was clearer -- would be clearer to people trying to understand the regulation.

1 And so justification, removing the exclusion of residents of the Kodiak Coast Guard base from the customary and traditional use determination for salmon in the Kodiak area would provide greater 5 access to subsistence opportunities for residents of 6 meet the Federal requirements for the base who 7 subsistence priority. Ιt would also inconsistent practice of providing Federal subsistence 9 salmon harvest opportunities to Coast Guard service 10 members who reside off base while excluding Coast Guard 11 members who reside on base from the same opportunities. 12 The data available currently shows that Coast Guard 13 base residents have a history of engaging in salmon 14 fisheries and other subsistence practices in the Kodiak 15 Islands since at least the early 1990s. Supporting this proposal is in keeping with the Board's stated 16 17 goal from 2016 to recognize customary and traditional 18 uses in the most inclusive manner possible. 19 necessary a section 804 subsistence user prioritization 20 analysis could be conducted in the future in the event 21 of salmon declines. And lastly changing the area 22 descriptors we believe for the customary 23 traditional use determination zones within the Kodiak 24 Island should clarify the areas under regulation both 25 for the public and reduce administrative complexity. 26 And we look forward to hearing your discussion and 27 recommendation on this proposal.

28 29

And lastly there were no written public comments submitted for this proposal.

30 31 32

33

 $$\operatorname{So}$ this concludes my presentation and I and other members of OSM are available for any questions you may have.

34 35

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

36 37

38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca, go 39 ahead.

40 41

42

MS. SKINNER: Thanks. Can you speak a little bit more about the section 804 subsistence user prioritization analysis?

43 44 45

46

47

48

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. So that would be something in the event of declines in the resource where I believe the Council or any interested party would submit a proposal requesting an 804 analysis basically determining who requires the resource the

most, right, who needs the resource the most among the pool of customary and traditional use qualified users in the area.

MS. SKINNER: And what are the allowable or recognized categories of users, so if you're prioritizing within users who have -- are subject to the C&T determination, what kinds of categories are you allowed to consider?

MR. ROBERTS: It would be users who fall under the C&T and it would be based on kind of history of residence, right, who's been there, records -- any records we have of harvest, right, who's using the resource more over time. This would be kind of how -- I don't know if anyone wants to chime in.

MS. SKINNER: Your phone a friend isn't

 working.

MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.

(Laughter)

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Thank you for your report, that was very precise. I have a few questions. On the summary on page 27, this proposal submitted by the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, why is that, normally interactions with Coast Guard Base the Special Services Officer or someone like that would make a request like this. And I'm curious because the definition of the base or the station....

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLMES:the base is a small component that's active military, but the station also includes the Aviation Hill and then the -- oh, I forget, the Lake Louise group.

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLMES: But also on that land is where the Fish and Wildlife Service people live at the Buskin because that's part of the State Coast Guard

0125 1 land. 2 3 MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh. 4 5 MR. HOLMES: 6 stimulus, I mean, why didn't this come from the Coast 7 Guard? 8

MR. ROBERTS: The original stimulus I believe for the Refuge submitting this is that they were having quite a hard time making distinctions on base versus off base residents in between determining who qualifies. And separating those people out in an effective and what they felt, you know, equitable manner.

So is that part of the

15 16 17

9

10

11

12

13

14

MR. HOLMES: I guess that would be in terms of the Federal permits that's issued.....

18 19 20

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

21 22

23

24

MR. HOLMES:because that's been a fairly recent occurrence for Kodiak is to have a Federal permit. And that evolved after the Fish and Game Advisory Committee, the State.....

25 26 27

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

28 29

30

31 32

33

34

36 37

38

39

40

41

MR. HOLMES:had changed things to not allow fishing overnight because a lot of fish were lost in the nets, people weren't doing that so they set the hours of 6:00 to 9:00. And my experience in Kodiak is almost everybody I know that's gotten the Federal permit they do that so they can get out on the grounds earlier and out compete the people that don't get out by 6:00 o'clock or they fish later at night to be able to fish on things when everybody else has got to stop. So it was done to help out folks, but yet I think there some abuse on those things, but that's just You said 44 subsistence permits military feelings. were issued off station. Those are people that probably lived in town and not on the base, right?

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

MR. ROBERTS: I'm sorry, I'm going to have to go back. That was 44 subsistence -- 43 subsistence permits, yeah. That report -- that was an ADF&G report and they're just talking about military households. So that could have been either on or off base, these are State subsistence reports or permits, I

mean.

MR. HOLMES: Well, I know quite a few folks in the Coast Guard many, many years and, you know, the folks that live off base generally are ones that are planning on staying, they're ones that re-up two or three times to stay in Kodiak. And so they really have a strong commitment to the community and the community effort. And I know at Fish and Game if you live off base and you're a resident that's no problem....

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLMES:but one does see down when people are launching their boats, folks putting in boats with Coast Guard station sticker on their bumper that's from another State.

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLMES: And so there's just a little bit of finagling that would need to be cleaned up and really enforced. So that's of interest. Back in '88 when this was created there was great concern in the community, both with the Alutiiq people and the folks that lived in Kodiak about it because the crab was falling off to almost nothing and the salmon stocks were not very strong at that time and so they were quite concerned about increasing competition....

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

MR. HOLMES:and that plus the rumors of people finagling. And I think most Coast Guard people are great, you know, but that was the reason why that ended up being implemented. And part of the thing on crab is they used to have out on base they had one or two great big, huge stainless steel And so folks would go out in the skiff in cookers. Women's Bay, get a whole load of king crab, put them in there and they had steam lines running out of the powerhouse and then they would cook them, bag them up and freeze them. And folks in town were wondering how can -- I forget how many people lived on the base there, but maybe a thousand or 1,500 and maybe a quarter of them were doing this, how can they use that much crab and where's the crab going. So that was -that's why it got implemented was the question of

0127 increased competition and concerns about that. 2 3 So anyway thank you for your report. 4 5 MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair. 6 7 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral. 8 9 MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Della. Do we 10 have a number and it's unfortunate, but no one's on the 11 phone from the Refuge to talk about this. But do we 12 know how many permits like say over the last three 13 years each year how many permits on issued for Federal 14 subsistence in the Kodiak waters there? 15 16 MR. ROBERTS: We during our trip a few 17 ago to Kodiak Island we met with the Refuge and I don't 18 really want to speak with them in exacting terms, but 19 they were saying very few, a very minimal amount. Oh, 20 got it right here. So this year there have been 17 21 permits, Federal permits for Kodiak. 22 23 MS. CHERNOFF: So we don't know how 24 many of those are Coast Guard? 25 26 MR. ROBERTS: No. 27 28 MS. CHERNOFF: Do we know -- oh, I 29 guess they'd all be resident? 30 31 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. Yeah. So 2022, 32 17; 2021, 18; 2020, 43; 2019, 40; 2018, 35; 2017, 55; 33 2016, 42. 34 35 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, Coral. 36 guess is probably two-thirds of those people are folks 37 that we know from town and they're doing it just to get 38 a little leg up on fishing. And anyway that's just an 39 emotional feeling. 40 41 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral, do you 42 have any more comments. 43 44 MS. CHERNOFF: I do. So I guess I find 45 it interesting that we define in order to get a permit it's all just based on residency. 46 So I was quite surprised to look 47 at these eight factors 48 determining customary and traditional use. And I guess 49 I'm kind of wondering why they don't come into play

myself, I guess that's kind of rhetorical, but I also just want to say in reading through these it seems like the Coast Guard, the people living on the Coast Guard base, and I would have to say I don't remember how long ago it was, but there are a lot of Coast Guard living off base now, but that's because they took down a whole bunch of housing they're going to rebuild so people had to find places to live in town. So that is one reason why there's so many Coast Guard living out and about.

But it just seems when I'm reading through these that being in the Coast Guard it seems like they just don't fit into a lot of these eight factors. One being long term consistent pattern of use. And you can say in general the Coast Guard as Coast Guard, but they're so transient so there is no real general pattern of use. I mean, I -- that's how I would interpret that.

A pattern of use recurring in specific seasons for many years. I don't think they demonstrate that being again transient. The methods and means, consistent harvest and use of fish and wildlife is related to past methods and means of taking. Once again that whole transiency, everyone who comes in is going to be using their own methods and means and finding, you know, where they're going to go.

of handling, Means preparing, preserving and storing fish or wildlife which has been traditionally used by past generations. And I find it interesting that we use a lot of words like traditional, indigenous, community, we use a lot of these to indicate I think sort of the original intent. So the original intent of this came through ANILCA which we say ANILCA, but what that stands for is Alaska Native Lands Claims. So while a lot of us realized that this came through, we seem to sort of twist and turn meanings with so many proposals moving forward that many of us who live in small communities and depend upon the resource, we just don't know what to say about it. It's like what's happening, we don't understand it.

Also pattern of use in which the harvest is shared or distributed with a definable community of persons. A pattern of use which relates to reliance, I think that's a big one, reliance upon a wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources of the

area and then on the page right above that it actually shows the median household income for the residents of Kodiak. Oh, wait, did it show the Coast Guard?

5 MS. SKINNER: It's.....

MR. HOLMES: She said yeah.

MS. SKINNER:87.04 with.....

MS. CHERNOFF: I....

MS. SKINNER: (Indiscernible - away 14 from microphone)....

MS. CHERNOFF: It seemed like there was quite a difference between there. The median household income for Kodiak service members was 87,000 during the five year period between 2016 and '20 and the median household income for the entire Kodiak Island Borough was 79,000 and residents off the road system was 43,000. So, you know, there's quite a difference there. And also in that distance -- that difference in income, the Coast Guard has their own grocery store which is considerably less than what we pay for in town. Their fuel is considerably less, their housing is considerably less or worked into their income. There's many differences that I feel like do not work into this use of subsistence -- qualifying for Federal subsistence with the Coast Guard base. And if I had to go further and you go well, you know, what about the people that live off base, I would consider them just not to be -- I don't know.

And I guess because this has been visited a few times too and it's continued to be in place, I think, you know, that's another consideration.

I think that's it. Thank you.

 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Well, I mean, some of those are things I can't really answer for you, that's more for the Council to deliberate. But I think part of this is recognizing again it's differences in the way in which we're trying to recognize, use, right. We're looking at the Coast Guard base as a community and, you know, well, I mean, you could argue that, I could argue that you're twisting it the other way. But yes, so the members turnover, but are their traditions

0130 being passed on at the Coast Guard base, I don't know. We don't -- we don't have the information to say that, but we do have the information showing that they're harvesting salmon, they're using salmon, they're sharing salmon, receiving salmon from other people in a manner quite similar to Kodiak city. And so there's 6 7 argument, right, is the Coast Guard base dramatically different than Kodiak city. I don't know. 8 9 Again that's something to..... 10 11 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: 12 We're just -- on the line everybody says they're getting a lot of static so maybe just not rub your 13 14 shirt or something. 15 16 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

17 18

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Thank you.

19 20

MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.

21 22

23

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: So I -that's another thing to deliberate which I don't have the answer to, I'm just pointing that out.

24 25 26

MR. ROBERTS: I feel like there's something else I was going to say, but I forgot it.

27 28 29

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Sorry.

30 31

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Turn your mic off when you're done speaking.

32 33

Katya, did you have a comment.

34 35 36

37

38 39

40

41

42

MS. WESSELS: I just wanted to let the Council know, Madame Chair, that you earlier asked if there was anybody from the Refuge to answer questions. Mike Brady from Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge is online. He's just having a hard time hearing what's being said in the room, they still have hard time hearing everybody who's on the phone. If you have any questions for him he is online.

43 44

Thank you.

45 46 47

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. this is Della. Do you have -- from what you've heard at this point do you have any comments in regard to

49 50

0131

1 some of the questions that were presented?

2

3 MR. BRADY: Sure. Hi, Madame Chair.

4 Yeah, I'm having a hard time hearing folks. I can hear

5 Coral real well. So I will say that we had a lot of

Yeah, I'm having a hard time hearing folks. I can hear Coral real well. So I will say that we had a lot of problems giving out permits over the last few years, mostly because we can give out -- we hear that the State gives out subsistence permits and they wonder why they can't get the Federal subsistence permits. And then it's like you were saying, some households can, some households can't. So that part of the regulation we would like to clarify one way or the other is just to make our lives easier and then later on I guess 23-05b we'll talk about some of the revisions and some of the clarifications we'd like to see in that. But so

there's just a little bit of inconsistency once they become able to get State subsistence permits why -- yeah, I guess that's their discussion, their question is why would they be denied a Federal subsistence

20 permit.

So that's all I have.

MS. KENNER: Madame Chair, this is Pippa Kenner.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I heard somebody say Madame Chair, but I didn't quite get what was said. Can you repeat that, please.

MS. KENNER: Yes. Hi. This is Pippa Kenner with OSM. I'm backing up Jason for this meeting. Am I recognized?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes, you are, Pippa, go ahead.

MS. KENNER: Okay. Thanks. Hey, Jason, I was just wondering if you might want to address the acronym ANILCA means because it's common for people to think the N means Native, but it actually — I'll just say it, it's the Alaska National Interest Lands Act. That's what ANILCA stands for. The other Act is ANCSA. And ANCSA is the Alaska Native Claims Settlement.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So ANCSA is

0132 1 Alaska Native Claims and ANILCA is Alaska National Lands.... 2 3 4 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Interest 5 Lands. 6 7 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:Interest 8 Lands. 9 10 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: But the 11 difference is (indiscernible away from 12 microphone) issue. 13 14 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, they ref 15 -- and she -- they reference the same issue. 16 17 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Yeah. 18 19 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm going to 20 kind of go back on this. Sometimes when you've been on this Council for 25 years. You know, I recall and, 21 Pat, maybe help me, at one point in time when there was 22 23 the determining a rural preference for communities and I recall Kodiak taking the Coast Guard 24 25 out as for population purposes to determine rural and 26 that's how they were able to get recognized as a rural 27 community. 28 29 Go ahead, you had a comment. 30 31 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. So I mentioned 32 that in the longer analysis there that was one of the 33 original issues or an earlier Chair was worried about 34 that. 35 36 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, exactly. 37 Because I do recall the hearing being at the Statewide 38 hearing for that at one point in time. 39 40 The other things is what's hard to go 41 through this and looking at the eight factors is as 42 Coral brought up is the fact when you turn around and say well, you're classified as a rural resident if you 44 live in a community for one year and if you can determine that I'm a Coast Guard member, but I lived in 45 46 Kodiak for one year, then technically I'm a rural 47 resident. So I would be eligible technically for a

Federal permit. So it gets confusing and I can

understand wanting to clarify and the purpose of this

48

49

0133 may be clarification, but it does -- it still is 2 confusing. 3 4 MR. ROBERTS: I'm sorry. 5 6 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So I guess I'm 7 not sure where we're at with this, the next -- going to the next steps on public. So we have comments, we --That's -- you said there was no 9 agency comments. 10 public comments. 11 12 MR. ROBERTS: There are no written 13 public comments. 14 15 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Written public 16 So the question is is there any report on comments. 17 Board consultation with tribes or ANCSA corporations. 18 19 MR. ROBERTS: That would be I believe 20 Orville. Orville would have.... 21 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Orville, are you 22 23 online, I have -- I did not hear you. 24 25 (No comments) 26 27 HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: MS. 28 Chair, I believe -- well, I talked to Orville a couple 29 days ago and he did say that there were none from the 30 tribes or the.... 31 32 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Thank 33 you, Lisa. 34 35 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: There could 36 be someone that want to call in for today though. 37 38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there any --39 well, we do have public testimony on this farther down the agenda. So the next we'd moved to agency comments. 40 41 42 ADF&G, do you have any comments in 43 regard to this proposal. 44 45 MS. KEATING: Thank you, Madame Chair. 46 This is Jackie Keating with the Division 47 Subsistence. I can take a first stab at our public 48

comments.

First of all for the background, this mostly mirrors what OSM already covered, but just to restate that salmon are harvested in Kodiak waters for subsistence use under State regulations and Federal. In general the Federal regulations for salmon fishing mirror State subsistence regulations that are already in place for those waters. As you likely know the two exceptions are that rod and reel is recognized as a subsistence gear under Federal regulations and Federally-qualified users may fish 24 hours per day whereas State subsistence fisheries are open between 6:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m.

Our position at the Department of Fish and Game is neutral on these decisions. And we -- we are neutral on the proposal as to the requirement for participation in subsistence under ANILCA. We do recommend that the Federal Subsistence Board thoroughly and carefully review the data relative to the eight criteria for this community.

And we're happy to answer further questions. And again just for the record the updated harvest data for Coast Guard base should be finalized sometime very early in 2023 following a full community data review.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Chris, do you have a comment.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ PRICE: I -- you mentioned like how many pounds they get per family, was it?

MR. ROBERTS: Per household.

MR. PRICE: Per household.

MR. ROBERTS: Uh-huh.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ PRICE: How does it compare to the rest of Kodiak, the -- is it about the same?

MR. ROBERTS: Let me look. No, it was similar to road connected communities, but less.

48 MR. PRICE: A little less. Okay.

```
0135
 1
                    MR. ROBERTS: Well, no, it was less by
    quite a bit for non-road, communities located off the
   road. So you can see some of that on table 1. That's
    for 1991. Yeah, but the general pattern is it's
    similar to Kodiak city, but less than communities
 5
    located off the road.
 6
 7
 8
                    MR. PRICE: Okay. So.....
 9
10
                    MS. KEATING:
                                   Madame Chair, this is
11
    Jackie Keating, Division of Subsistence.
12
13
                    MADAME CHAIR
                                   TRUMBLE: Go ahead,
14
    Jackie.
15
16
                    MS. KEATING: Thank you. If I could
17
    just further add to the response to that question with
18
    the updated data. When we look at the per capita
19
    harvest for 2021 it was 46 pounds for Kodiak Station
20
    and then residents of Kodiak city it was 74 and for the
21
    remaining Kodiak road it was 87.
22
23
                    Thank you.
24
25
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: And, Chris, you
26
    have another question or comment.
27
28
                    MR. PRICE: So these Coast Guard folks,
29
    they fish in the same place as everyone else does with
30
    the same type of gear?
31
32
                    MR. ROBERTS:
                                   They fish under State
33
    subsistence or sport regulations.
34
35
                    MR. PRICE: And so the main reason
36
    they're not being considered equally on this is because
37
    they don't have a customary and traditional definition
38
    because they live on the base?
39
40
                    MR.
                          ROBERTS:
                                       Yeah,
                                               they
                                                     were
41
    originally excluded because of living on the base.
42
43
                    MR. PRICE: Yeah.
44
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Your mic.
45
46
47
                    MR. PRICE: Oh.
48
49
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's what we
```

talked about, Chris, earlier when they were first determining a rural preference for Kodiak because of the population they left the population of the Coast Guard out.

4 5 6

Okay. Any other.....

7

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

8 9 10

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

MS. CHERNOFF: I just want to make a comment too when I was listening, you know, they have all their own facilities, they also — which now kids from Bells Flat go to that school, but they've always had their own school too. They have an elementary school in addition to all their other kind of contained services. And I don't believe I read that in the report or anything about their grocery stores, the commissaries and all that.

20 21 22

23

24

MR. ROBERTS: There was mention of that briefly in the first part of the report. It was one of the original reasons that the Kodiak Chair objected to inclusion in 1994, that was part of the reason.

252627

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

28 29

MS. SKINNER: Rebecca.

30 31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, I'm just going to make some brief comments now. When I was in elementary school I actually attended Peterson Elementary which is -- he's not sure if it's located on the Coast Guard base, but it's directly adjacent. So I went to elementary school, first grade through fifth grade, mostly with, you Coast Guard kids. My experience was they were generally there a couple of years and then they would transfer. A lot of them did not transfer into -- you know, when I had moved into middle school and had to get bussed to town, there weren't a lot of kids there that I went to school with because they had already left. And then just the -- my thinking back to my experience, the -- you know, the kind of experiences and the lifestyle that those kids had was very different from what I grew up with. And obviously none of that's in the report because that's not what you were, you know, looking at or focused on. want to comment that there is a definite cultural

1 difference.

I also wanted to reiterate and Coral did mention the housing allowance that the Coast Guard families get, is substantial. And not only is it a benefit for the Coast Guard recipients who get it, it has an impact on everyone else who lives in Kodiak because it keeps the price of housing unusually high. So that's a financial benefit and as Coral says they —there's cheaper access to groceries, to fuel, flights off of the Island, recreational kinds of activities. So there's very definite things that the Coast Guard on base population and off base population has access to that other residents of the Kodiak area do not have access to.

Thank you.

 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral. Yeah. And I just wanted to add which I didn't mention and this kind of ties into what Rebecca says, their culture of how they fish and hunt is very different. They don't hunt for need, they don't hunt -- and so I guess when I -- I guess I was thinking of in the part where you said, you know, they have this tradition of sharing and I think it was in some other report about, you know, a certain amount of fish is shared or a certain amount is caught. That can all be -- that can all happen under sport and State subsistence for them for sure.

Yeah, that's all I have to say.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, everything's currently happening under State regs for Coast Guard base residents.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So and just going back to that discussion and when you look at even the discussion and justification and substantial evidence such as biological and traditional ecological knowledge and that's what's being referenced strongly here, but I don't -- I could be wrong, but I don't -- in the past whenever we had a proposal like this in front of us we had an archeologist or anthropologist giving a report that would substantiate and support in this case Kodiak Refuge's request to allow for a Federal permit for the base. Am I correct on this?

9

11

12

13

14

15

MS. WESSELS: Thank you, Madame Chair. I don't really have an answer to your question, but I just want to remind the Council that we need to go through the process in the right way. Because it appears to me that the Council started having a discussion, but we didn't hear for all these other entities that we have who might have commented, State and Federal agencies and the, you know, others. And I think that's up to that -- you know, you heard the presentation of the proposal and now we need to go through all these other steps. And after the motion -after the motion is on the floor then the Council can So I guess if you have some have a discussion. clarifying question for the presenter that perhaps we need to go through the other steps before the Council as a group discusses the proposal on the floor.

16 17 18

Thank you.

19 20

21

22

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you for that because we're running out of -- time is going by here too fast. So I guess at this point I'm under agency comments. Are we on Federal or tribal?

232425

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{So}}$$ there weren't any comments listed in the book.

262728

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

29

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat.

30 31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

MR. HOLMES: Point of clarification. I believe we asked for Fish and Game comments and Jackie Keaton from Subsistence Division gave those to us. There was nobody from Comm Fish, they're the ones that do the management in issuing the permits for Fish and Game. There were no written public comments, no comments from the tribe. And I don't know that we've had a InterAgency Committee so I think we've gone through a lot of those steps, haven't we?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I think, Pat, maybe just for the record we'll call them out. So at this point the next group would be Advisory Groups comments, other Regional Advisory Councils.

45 46 47

44

(No comments)

48 49

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Fish and Game

```
0139
 1
    Advisory Committees.
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Subsistence
 6
    Resource Commissions.
 7
 8
                    (No comments)
 9
10
                    UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm here.
11
12
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Are you wanting
13
    to speak to this proposal.
14
15
                     (No comments)
16
17
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Summary of
18
    written public comments.
19
20
                     (No comments)
21
22
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                              There wasn't
23
    any. Public testimony. would anybody like to speak to
24
     this Proposal FP 23-05a.
25
26
                     (No comments)
27
28
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right.
29
    Regional Council Recommendations.
30
31
                    MR. BRADY: This is Mike Brady again.
32
33
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh.
34
35
                    MR. BRADY:
                                   I'd like to make one
36
     comment, Della, just for clarification is that's okay.
37
38
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Go ahead,
39
    Mike.
40
41
                    MR. BRADY: I'll just say that this all
42
    came about because of Litnik, because the State has a
43
    time limit on their subsistence permit and Federal
    permit does not have a time limit. So that's -- when
44
45
    the Coast Guard folks figured out, that's when this all
46
     came to fruition that there's a time difference in when
47
     the specific permits are allowed, when you're allowed
48
     to actually fish.
49
```

I just wanted to make that clarification and that's why this comes up and this is why it's become a little bit of a controversy.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Mike. And, you know, I think it would have been nice to have people that are requesting this of the Refuge to make a proposals to speak to it and in support of it and the reasoning behind it. I think at this point we're -- just as a comment.

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: (Indiscernible - away from microphone)....

 $$\operatorname{MADAME}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. So we are still on Regional Council recommendations. Motion to adopt.

MR. PAPPAS: Madame Chair, George Pappas, OSM. I have one piece of information.

 $\label{eq:madame} \mbox{{\tt MADAME}} \mbox{{\tt CHAIR}} \mbox{{\tt TRUMBLE:}} \mbox{{\tt Go}} \mbox{{\tt ahead,}} \\ \mbox{{\tt George.}}$

MR. PAPPAS: Good day, Madame Chair, and members of the Council. One of the reasons that folks get a Federal subsistence permit is because rod and reel is legal to use for Federal subsistence in marine waters. So that's where the permit started coming from and folks wanted permits to fish for Federal subsistence. They are looking -everybody uses a State subsistence permit, but the State subsistence permit cannot allow or does not authorize the use of rod and reel. So about 2012 came together and I think '13 was maybe the first year they started issuing rod and reel permits. That doesn't add much to your conversation, but there was a discussion about permits earlier.

Thank you, Madame Chair, appreciate it.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So given that description, George, we can request a rod and reel subsistence permit on Russell Creek or any of the waters around Cold Bay? You don't need to answer that

1 now.

MR. PAPPAS: Madame Chair, I don't want to wade into, it's got errors and discussion points there, but I was just specifically recognizing the Kodiak area and why folks were getting permits from Kodiak. And if you want to expand a little bit, yes, if the State does not allow rod and reel in freshwaters and they are waters under the Federal subsistence fisheries jurisdiction, the RAC and the Federal Subsistence Board can put forth a regulation to allow And because of those -rod and reel in those. specifically for an example in Chignik, folks can use rod and reel, but you may not -- the State won't authorize a permit so if you had one you'd have to get one under the Federal program. So not to confuse you, just adding one piece of information to this.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. And it gets confusing sometimes because the Federal will change regulations to mirror the State and then sometimes now. So it -- it is a -- makes it all a little confusing.

All right. Moving on. Any other Regional Council recommendations.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ KOSO: Madame Chair, Rick here. Quick question.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Rick.

MR. KOSO: Yeah, I -- for George. I must of -- I've been confused by this for quite some time now and subsistence permitted by the State, the ADF&G permit. On the ADF&G permits through a sport fishing license, that's rod and reel for sport fishing license. So what's the difference in the Federal subsistence and ADF&G sport fishing?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Well, what was stated, Rick, is that you can't use a rod and reel for State subsistence.

MR. PAPPAS: Through the Chair, Mr. Koso. The difference being in your region rod and reel's not allowed under State for subsistence methods

```
0142
    and means.
               The Federal program has adopted it.
    there are many places including Kodiak you're allowed
             rod and reel under Federal subsistence
    regulations
                 in waters
                              under Federal
                                             subsistence
    jurisdiction. That is not sport fishing, you do not
 5
    need a State of Alaska sport fishing license to Federal
 6
 7
    subsistence fish.
                         I'm uncertain I answered your
    question, but there's a clear line to us, I know it's
    not a clear line to you because we're talking about the
 9
10
    same person in the same spot with the same gear chasing
11
    the same fish.
12
13
                    Thank you, Madame Chair.
14
15
                    MR. KOSO: Yeah, thanks, George.
16
17
                    MS. HAYDEN:
                                   Madame Chair, this is
18
    Natasha.
19
20
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Natasha.
21
22
                    MS. HAYDEN:
                                  Thank you. Are we on
23
    Committee comments now?
24
25
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We're on Council
26
    recommendations, motion to adopt.
27
28
                    MS. HAYDEN:
                                 Council recommendation --
29
    I'm sorry, I just want to make sure. Is it -- is this
30
    a good opportunity for me to provide my comments on the
31
    proposal?
```

31 proposal?
32

33

34

35 36

37

38 39

40 41

42 43 44

45

46

MS. WESSELS: Somebody needs to make a motion so it can be discussed.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Natasha, I'm sorry I just missed that. Someone needs to make a motion and in most cases it needs to be in the affirmative. And then we can open it for discussion and then it needs to be voted up or down, approve or don't approve. In this particular case we may -- I'll recommend that we do it by roll call.

MS. HAYDEN: Okay. Thank you, Madame Chair.

47 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. 48

49 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat. 50

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, George's comment there, I think tickled the back of my brain because I had mentioned to some of the folks that our.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, we're making a motion in regard to the.....

9 MR. HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry. I'll be 10 quiet.

 $$\operatorname{MADAME}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yeah, thank you. To adopt the recommendation for FP 23-05a. Do I hear a motion to approve.

MS. WESSELS: I just want to also remind the Council that if anyone makes a motion it doesn't mean that you agree with that proposal. Making a motion just puts this -- opens an opportunity for you to discuss it. So if anybody is against this, you know, you still can make motion and it needs to be seconded and then you have a discussion.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That was my point. And then you vote it up or down. So I might -- in this particular case it may recommended to do a per person vote, roll call vote.

MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt.

MS. SKINNER: Oh, I was just going to ask that we explain the other way if nobody makes a motion what happens?

 $\ensuremath{\texttt{MADAME}}$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: No action is taken.

MS. WESSELS: So if you don't make a motion then you don't provide a recommendation to the Board and the Board is left to its devices deciding how they going to vote. So they're going to have a recommendation from the InterAgency Staff Committee, they going to have a recommendation from the State, but they won't have any recommendation from the Council. And the Board relies on the recommendations of the Councils. And they weigh heavily on the Council recommendation. Yes, they usually defer to the Council recommendation unless for the three things that are stated in ANILCA when they can disagree with the

```
0144
 1
   Councils.
 2
 3
                   MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral, one more
 4
   comment and we do have.....
 5
 6
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah.
 7
 8
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: ....a motion on
9
    the floor.
10
11
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Okay. I just wanted to
12
    ask a question about that. Then do they just look at
13
    our recommendation or do they -- are all our comments
14
    provided to them?
15
16
                    MS. WESSELS: Oh, your recommendation
17
    will be, you know, to adopt or not adopt or take no
18
    action. Sometimes, you know when it's a crossover
19
    proposal you can defer to another Council, but this is
20
    not the case here. And then we provide justification
21
    why the Council voted these or that way and we develop
22
    a language for the justification based on you guys'
23
    discussion here. So that's about it.
24
25
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So Pat did make
26
    a motion to approve FP 23-05a. We need a second.
27
28
                    MS. WESSELS: I think it was Rick.
29
30
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh.
31
32
                    MR. PRICE: No, he did.
33
34
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: It was Pat.
35
36
                    MS. WESSELS: Oh, it was. Okay.
37
    Sorry.
38
39
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: This was one --
    this whole thing has gone on a long time. So do we
40
    hear a second and then we can have discussion and then
41
42
    go for a roll call vote. Do I hear a second.
43
44
                    MR. PRICE: I'll second.
45
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second by Chris.
46
47
48
                    MS. HAYDEN: Second. This is Natasha.
49
```

0145 1 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Given the first and second can we -- and now it's open basically for 2 discussion. 4 5 Chris. 6 7 MR. PRICE: So.... 8 9 MS. HAYDEN: Madame Chair, this is 10 Natasha. 11 12 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Natasha, just 13 hold up here. We got Chris and then I can call on you. 14 15 MR. PRICE: My question is right here. 16 Will the recommendation be beneficial or detrimental to 17 subsistence needs and uses. What was -- the evaluation 18 you guys gave us on that? 19 20 MR. ROBERTS: The preliminary 21 evaluation is that this would provide more subsistence 22 opportunity to residents of the Coast Guard base. It 23 is currently unclear how many residents of the Coast 24 Guard base would actually qualify as Alaskan residents. 25 We don't have those numbers. 26 27 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So that's part of what's confusing about all this, without those 28 29 numbers and someone going and saying this is how many 30 people on base basically say they'd utilize us. 31 have -- there's no numbers, you have no idea what the 32 impact would be if this was passed in any resource, in this case fish. 33 So that's where it gets a little --34 gets a little -- just doesn't feel like there's enough 35 substance documentation especially when you go back to 36 the customary and traditional use, the eight factors. 37 And that's just my opinion, I couldn't -- maybe I'm 38 wrong, but that's what..... 39 40 MR. ROBERTS: You know, I would say 41 yeah, I apologize that there's not as much information 42 in this as I guess you typically find, this is the 43 information I could find to give you. 44 45 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Is there any 46 other comments. 47 48

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, I think that we need to think also about where most of this takes place and that's at the Buskin. And we've had what, three years out of the last five that the fishery's been restricted. I might be wrong in that, but I know that the runs to the Buskin have become considerably more erratic. Myself I wouldn't decline folks that live off base, but I think that adding three or 400 families into the subsistence for the Buskin could substantially increase competition for a limited resource.

13 14 15

Thank you, Madame Chair.

16 17

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Natasha, I apologize, I did forget to recognize you.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49

50

MS. HAYDEN: That's okay, Madame Chair. Out of sight, out of mind. My own fault. I really appreciate the discussion, I appreciate presentation. I also really appreciate the additional information that has been presented by the agencies and my fellow Council members regarding the demographic or the composition of the people who both attended the school at Peterson and the difference between the residency of people who live on base versus Coast Guard personnel and support that live off of base. Having, you know, been born and raised here and spending my -most of my life here, being very familiar with the disparity, there is a disparity between the benefits and the access that Coast Guard personnel and depends have with the resources they have on base related to, you know, full grocery store and department store and fuel purchasing, but in addition to that they have also got a very robust -- it's called MWR, morale, welfare and recreation program that has everything anybody could possibly need or want to pursue fish and game for recreation and sport. And that includes boats, includes they got a fish house where they've got processing facilities, they've got every -- all the supplies that people need to package up their take. I they have, you know, four-wheelers think terrestrial pursuits. And I appreciate the comment Mr. Pappas made about the desire for -- of individuals to obtain a subsistence permit so that they could utilize rod and reel for subsistence in areas outside of the Buskin like Litnik which reminded again like Pat

referenced the three out of five years where we'd had low abundance in the Buskin River in where I haven't been able to get my subsistence just using my State issued subsistence permit. And a couple of those years I've witnessed a huge amount of truck and trailer and boat launching traffic out at Antone Larson where people are able to launch their larger size vessels too with the intention of increased fishing activity over at Litnik, over by Ouzinkie, over at Port Lions. So people are able to go further to pursue more fish than they had in the past.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42

43

7

9

10

Thank you for your patience to my colleagues because I'm just trying to get everything in that has been kind of going through my mind. Earlier Coral had made reference to the Alaska Native Land Claim Act when -- I believe when she was -- she was referring to ANILCA which clarified that ANILCA is indeed Alaska National Interest Land whatever it is, ANILCA. And but I do want to just point out that originally ANILCA was intended in part to remedy some portions of resource access and management that were not included in ANCSA and what exists now as being quote, unquote, the rural preference, was intended to be indigenous Alaska Native preference. And, you know, because there was a severe backlash against it being discriminatory -- you know, potentially being discriminatory the final language is rural preference. And so and I think when I was reading through here and it says going back the -- you know, the history going back, history of usage of personnel on the Coast Guard base going back to the 1990s, it is -- you know, to me making a consideration of customary and traditional use for personnel who are not the same personnel that are sort of the revolving cohorts of personnel that are come -- you know, transferred in and out every three years roughly, in the same category of what I consider to be customary and traditional use is -- I think it's interesting. And I just want to highlight that I think I agree with or I agree with what I think that Coral was trying to get at with the ANILCA and Alaska Native Claims and traditional customary use by indigenous people as not being the same as what is being described here in my mind.

44 45 46

47

48

49

50

So yeah, again thank you for your patience. I would -- I'm not supportive of this because also in addition there isn't any household data, there isn't any information on the number of

individuals that would be eligible to participate in this if it were to be adopted. And there was one other thought that I had, but I -- it just kind of escaped me so I will stop there.

So thanks, Madame Chair.

 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Natasha. A point of clarification maybe. I keep hearing reference to the commissary and the stores and the different things that are available on the base. However if you look at the eight factors nothing in those eight factor address the -- any of those issues. They basically are looking at customary trade, use over time, the areas and the handling. So I -- it keeps coming up, but I think the point here is a determination of the C&T and I just from my perspective don't feel like that is strong enough to support approving this decision. Does that make sense?

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: To me, it does reference it here. Number 8 says that it's determined by a pattern of use which relates to reliance which is why I brought that up, a reliance upon a wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources of the area and which provides substantial cultural, economic, social and nutritional elements to the community or area. And I think it's very relevant to that.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. I don't know about anybody else, but I think maybe we're do to do a roll call vote.

MR. BRADY: Madame Chair, this is Mike again -- Mike Brady at Kodiak, I'd like to make one more comment.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Mike.

MR. BRADY: So I'm just looking for clarification because people come to our door for these permits and if you look at the Federal subsistence harvest of wildlife it also doesn't say anything about the Coast Guard. So if we're going to stay with this line of -- we're just going to have to get both

booklets and make sure that they're similar because those are the kinds of questions we're going to get from folks that come to the door to get permits.

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Mike, I guess I'm curious when this was put together. When you look at the eight factors why weren't each of those eight factors taken individually in writing what determined or supported the factors under that item. And if you look at these that's I think where some of the confusion is also. It -- you know, if I were to read this and look at this, I hear you saying that the reason behind it is because they want the permit to be able to harvest subsistence on Federal lands after the State and that it's an issue of having to deal with the paperwork and the people because there is no -- there's nothing in place. And I may be getting tired, but that's kind of what I'm understanding here. whether that's enough to support at this time, I don't know if we can -- if it's an issue that can be tabled and if you were going to really support pushing this through that a little more effort be put into those eight factors. And having people from the base actually testifying that hey, we would like this and this is why, that might be a little more beneficial for us to sit here and try to make -- try to vote on this right now. If I had a recommendation I'd say table it and if you really support pushing this through that we put a little more effort into it.

293031

Coral.

32 33

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I guess before we wrap this up I just....

343536

MR. BRADY: This is Mike. I didn't work on the eight factors.....

37 38 39

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

40 41

MR. BRADY:I didn't work on the eight factors, but I did want clarification because it is difficult.

43 44 45

42

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Coral.

46 47

MS. CHERNOFF: Thank you, Della. So I just wanted to make my comments before this discussion wraps up. I will be voting no for this because I think

49 50

of the -- most especially I feel like it doesn't fit into those sort of eight reasons that are mentioned, the eight factors of determining customary and traditional use. I think also they have access to the 5 resource through other fisheries. And like I was talking about the culture of how they hunt and fish, 6 7 it's different than that dependence -- that dependence And that the reliance which it states in that on it. reason, the reliance upon the resource. And I think 9 10 Mike had made a comment earlier that part of this 11 coming in was that people wanted to go to Litnik, they 12 didn't like the fishery for State closed down early and 13 they wanted more fishing time. I think that's kind of 14 the culture of the fishery. A lot of people coming up 15 to Alaska, they can't wait to get to that one year and then it's just the all out Alaskan experience without 16 17 regard to the people that are still going to be there 18 when they move away, without regard to the resource. 19 I've experienced several times people duck hunting and 20 the ducks are hanging out in the back of their truck 21 and they're like yeah, I give those to my dogs, my dogs 22 love them. Not legal, but it's the big Alaskan 23 experience. And living around, I'm not going to say 24 all the Coast Guard is like this, I think I just want 25 to say that I'm going to be voting no because I know 26 and I live there and it is a very different culture 27 than reliance upon the resource for their families.

28 29

Thank you.

30 31

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Any more comments from anybody.

32 33 34

MS. SKINNER: I have a comment.

35 36

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

37 38

39

40

41

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to thank Jason for the report and the presentation. I know this wasn't a -- it's not a particularly easy issue. And so thank you for the report and giving us the information.

42 43 44

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: All right. Is everybody ready for a roll call vote.

45 46 47

MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Question.

48 49

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Oh, question.

```
0151
   Is there a question.....
 3
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Call.
 4
 5
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: ....call for
 6
   question.
 7
 8
                    MR. HOLMES: I call for question.
 9
10
                   MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
11
   Lisa, roll call.
12
13
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Patrick
14
    Holmes.
15
16
                    MR. HOLMES: No.
17
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Richard
18
19
   Koso.
20
21
                   (No comments)
22
23
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Richard
24
   Koso.
25
26
                   (No comments)
27
28
                   MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: You can go back
29
   to him.
30
31
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Christopher
32
   Price.
33
34
                   MR. PRICE: No.
35
36
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Coral
37
    Chernoff.
38
39
                   MR. KOSO: Can you hear me now on
    there. Sorry, Della.
40
41
42
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: That's
43
   okay. Richard, your vote.
44
45
                    MR. KOSO: Can you hear me?
46
47
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Yes, we can
48
    hear you.
49
```

```
0152
                    MR. KOSO: Oh, yeah. Well, I'm going
 1
   to vote no with the Kodiak people because I'm going to
    just follow their suit and I don't know enough about
    that to make, you know, a good, educated vote on it.
 5
    So I'll go with the majority of Kodiak and I'll vote
 6
    no.
 7
 8
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Coral
 9
    Chernoff.
10
11
                    MS. CHERNOFF: No.
12
13
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Rebecca
14
    Skinner.
15
16
                    MS. SKINNER: No.
17
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
18
                                                    Della
19
    Trumble.
20
21
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No.
22
23
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Natasha
24
    Hayden.
25
26
                   MS. HAYDEN: No.
27
28
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: And I don't
29
   believe Sam Rohrer's on the phone, correct?
30
31
                    (No comments)
32
33
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: So seven
34
    nos. It failed.
35
36
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Well, all I can
37
    say is that was a tough discussion. And, you know, I
38
    did like -- if there was more on here to substantiate
39
    it I might change my mind, but I just don't feel
40
    comfortable enough at this point to vote in that
41
    manner.
42
43
                   If we can we'll go ahead and take a 10
    minute break. And we're going to go ahead and go on
44
45
    until 6:00 because our dinner will be at 6:00 and we'll
46
    at least try to get one or two more proposals done.
47
48
                    Okay. Break time.
49
```

0153
1 (Off record)
2
3 (On record)
4
5 MADAME CHAIR

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: So the next item on the agenda if FP 23-05b.

Justin Koller.

MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madame Chair. This is Justin Koller with the Office of Subsistence Management. FP 23-05b, the analysis of this proposal begins on page 43 of your meeting books.

FP 23-05b submitted by the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge requests a change in the description of a Kodiak Island fishing area. proponent states that this description change necessary to clarify the area under regulation and to make it clear for those interpreting Federal fishing regulations. If you turn to page 43 in the executive summary, subsection A currently begins with Federal public waters of Kodiak Island and goes on to describe a subsection of the Kodiak Island area. The proponent is asking for a small change in how this subsection A area description begins specifically by replacing Federal public waters of Kodiak Island with road accessible zone and northeastern Kodiak Island in parentheses Federal public waters comprise marine waters within Women's Bay and this is on figure 1 on page 47. There are no inland Federal public waters in the Kodiak road system area and the primary subsistence fishery in this area targets salmon in the marine waters of Women's Bay.

The proposed amendment to the area description would have no effects other than providing a degree of clarity to Federally-qualified subsistence users and reduce confusion for anyone interpreting Federal subsistence fishing regulations in this area.

 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support Proposal FP 23-05b. This area description change is likely to clarify the area specified in regulations and would cause no negative impact to Federally-qualified subsistence users or the fisheries resource. In a way this -- one way to look at it is as a housekeeping proposal.

0154		
1 2		Thank you.
3 4 5 6	if the people is sure appreciate	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. So n the kitchen could come out here I'd it.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	out. Is this of it would basicathat. So next	So the next where we're at on this I'm trying to figure this process correct here on the back of this so that ally the introduction, we just did is report on Board consultation for ANCSA corporations. Were there any
15 16 17 18	Orville is not a none	MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: I believe vailable today, but he said there were
19		MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you
20 21 22 23	Chair.	MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:Madame
24 25 26	Lisa. Agency co	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:thank you, mments.
27 28 29		ADF&G. (No comments)
30 31 32 33	take that as no	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I'm going to comments.
34 35		Federal agencies.
36 37		(No comments)
38 39 40	anybody from Su this proposal.	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Tribal entities, in'aq have any comments in regards to
41 42		(No comments)
43 44 45	comments, Other	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Advisory Group Regional Councils.
46 47		(No comments)
48 49 50		MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Fish and Game

```
0155
    Advisory Committees.
 2
 3
                    (No comments)
 4
 5
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Subsistence
 6
    Resource Commissions.
 7
 8
                    (No comments)
 9
10
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Any summary of
11
    written public comments.
12
13
                    MR. KOLLER: There were no written
14
    public comments.
15
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you.
16
17
    public testimony.
18
19
                    (No comments)
20
21
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Regional Council
22
    recommendations, motion to adopt.
23
24
                    MR. HOLMES: Move to adopt.
25
26
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Motion made by
27
    Pat Holmes.
28
29
                    MS. CHERNOFF: Second.
30
31
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second by Coral.
32
    Discussion, justification.
33
34
                    Coral.
35
36
                    MS. CHERNOFF: So I guess I'll start.
37
    I have a question.
                         OSM is would you say you're
    supporting this -- you're in support of this; is that
38
39
    correct, OSM is?
40
41
                    MR. KOLLER:
                                  Through the Chair. Yes,
42
    we are in support.
43
44
                    MS. CHERNOFF: So I was just wondering
45
    if you could maybe describe for me how -- what was the
46
                               road accessible
    thought process
                        about
47
    northeastern Kodiak Island, how you found that to be
48
    less confusing than in the Federal public waters of
49
    Kodiak Island, kind of what was your thought there?
50
```

1 MR. KOLLER: Thank you. Through the Chair. I may defer to Mike Brady on this one if he's on the line because he was the proponent of this proposal. But that is more in alignment with how the State describes that area. The State also uses the Kodiak road zone. And that part of the description 7 starts by saying the Federal public waters of Kodiak Island. So right there that sort of implies the whole Island and then goes on to describe a subset of that 9 10 Island. And the idea is to provide annual limits for 11 the whole Kodiak Island area without having areas 12 unaccounted for. So I think just for clarification purposes because there was a lot of confusion with 13 14 people wandering into the Refuge and asking questions 15 about this. So they thought it would reduce user confusion in interpretation of the regulations. 16

17 18

Thank you.

19 20

21 22 MS. CHERNOFF: And then on the portion where -- I guess I never noticed before, but do you have any idea why we exclude the waters bordering Spruce Island?

232425

MR. KOLLER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

So....

262728

MR. HOLMES: Yeah, I can.....

29 30

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, do you have

a comment.

31 32

MR. HOLMES: I can answer that or Jeff

34 can.

35 36

MR. KOLLER: I'll defer to Pat gladly.

37 Thank you.

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

MR. HOLMES: Coral, that's because in the -- I think this definition comes basically from the game regs from the State. And so they don't include because it's a mile off Kodiak Island, but when you get on the north side over towards Ouzinkie, if you went a mile you'd be halfway across the Island. And so they are just pulling out Spruce Island and saying up to that point. At least that's my guess.

46 47

48 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral, are you

49 good.

0157 1 (No comments) 2 3 MS. SKINNER: Can I ask a question. 4 5 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca. 6 7 MS. SKINNER: When you were responding to Coral's question about how the road accessible zone 8 9 or I guess removing the Federal public waters of Kodiak 10 Island was more clear, I think you referred to -- did 11 you refer to the Federal waters -- Federal public 12 waters language appearing somewhere else as well or did 13 I misunderstand what you said? 14 15 MR. KOLLER: Through the Chair. 16 believe I was just referring to the words Federal 17 public waters of Kodiak Island there requesting to be 18 deleted from subsection A. 19 20 MS. SKINNER: So and I guess we have a 21 -- this is on the floor, right, we have a motion and a 22 second? 23 24 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Yes. 25 26 MS. SKINNER: We're discussing. 27 could go either way on this proposal. I think for the average person if you said road accessible zone, 28 northeastern Kodiak Island, that's probably more 29 30 intuitive to understand, you know, where that is and 31 what that looks like than if you just said in the 32 Federal public waters of Kodiak Island. My concern 33 though is dropping the words Federal public waters of 34 Kodiak Island because that's a big characteristic of 35 what we're talking about. And I guess those are my comments right now. There's things I like about it and 36 37 there's things that I don't like about it. 38 39 Thanks. 40 41 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Pat. 42 43 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Pat. 44 45 MR. HOLMES: I have a question here. 46 The way it's spelled out, it's been there for a while, 47 but it includes -- it says including waters of Woody

and Long Islands and saltwater bordering the area

within one mile of Kodiak Island. And I was wondering

48 49

if someone with OSM could give us some clarification as to why those are included as Federal waters because I haven't really seen a diagram of that before and I could be totally in error, but I just noticed that.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, I'm going to ask you to move closer to the mic and rephrase that question again, please.

MR. HOLMES: Let me rephrase the question and get closer to the mic. And I quess my question is this definition which has been in place I imagine for some time includes the waters of Woody and Long Island and within one mile of Kodiak Island. And so I'm wondering what is the rationale that those are Federal waters. I know there's the Women's Bay, and is Woody and Long Island, are those part of the Maritime Refuge and how are the other waters within one mile of Kodiak, how are they classified Federal in this document? Just -- sorry to be picky, but I just never thought of that before.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Does anybody want to take that question on.

MR. POLUM: Madame Chair, this is Tyler with Fish and Game. I'm obviously not with OSM, but I think I have an answer to several of these questions regarding that if I may.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Tyler.

MR. POLUM: Yeah, sorry to interrupt here. But, Pat, and the -- I can't remember -- I didn't catch who asked the previous question. These regulations are identical to old sport fishing regulations for the definition of the road zone area. So likely they were just copied directly from sport fishing regs just like many of the other regulations in the Federal Register were when they were enacted. As to jurisdiction and all that I don't -- I'm not -- I don't -- that's for OSM to speak on obviously.

But since in the last several years these for sport fishing have changed in a number of

ways so they're no longer current for sport fishing, but those as written are identical to what the previous sport fishing regulations were and had stood for three or four years up until the last six or seven years.

5 6

Hopefully that helps.

7

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HOLMES: Yes, thank you very much, Tyler.

9

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, so I'm just going to make my last comment. So I am going to be voting no for this because to me changing the language and removing Federal public waters of Kodiak Island which I think are very specific to Federal subsistence regulation and it makes Federal subsistence very clear. I think by removing it there's less clarity in what's And then I'm not really in favor of like happening. making the regulations, State and Federal say the same thing because like Tyler said this came from something before and now they've changed. And so things change. I think we should always just be specific to what we are doing and I think that gives the most clarity for me.

262728

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.

29 30

31

32

33

34

35

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, Coral. How about if it just simply left the Federal public waters of Kodiak Island comma and then put in the road accessible zone and that just is providing a little better definition of Federal public waters. And then that should save confusion on anybody that's asking because it just tells you right there the whole thing.

36 37 38

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Did you have a comment. State your names.

39 40 41

42

43

44

45 46 MR. AYERS: Good evening. This is Scott Ayers, OSM. I just was going to speak to something similar to what Mr. Holmes had mentioned was that if the Council would like to amend the motion in any way that they're totally able to do that if they wanted to add language different than what was recommended initially in the proposal.

47 48 49

Thank you.

```
0160
 1
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you,
 2
    Scott. Katya.
 4
                    MS. WESSELS: Katya Wessels and I -- if
 5
    you -- the Council decides to amend the originally
 6
    proposed language you'll need to have a motion to
 7
    modify and then vote on the original motion as
    modified. So you will need to have two motions.
 9
10
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.
11
12
                    MR. HOLMES: Madame Chairman, I would
13
    like to make a motion to modify the Proposal FP 23-05b.
14
15
16
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: You should state
17
    how you're modifying it, Pat, please.
18
19
                    MR. HOLMES: Oh, I quess I would modify
20
    it by leaving the first part of the sentence that's
21
    crossed out in place and then include what was added by
22
    the recommendation of the Refuge, road accessible zone,
23
    northeast Kodiak Island because that's very definitive.
24
25
                    Thank you, Madame Chair.
26
27
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.
28
    Is there a second to Pat's motion to modify.
29
30
                    Rebecca.
31
32
                    MS. SKINNER: Second.
33
34
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Second made by
35
    Rebecca. Discussion.
36
37
                    Coral.
38
39
                    MS. CHERNOFF: I'm still going to vote
40
    no on this amendment. I think making more words so now
41
    instead of having two clarifiers we'll have three
42
    clarifiers and I think the more words and the more
43
    clarifiers you have, it's just added confusion to the
                So I'm going to be voting no on the
44
    language.
45
    amendment.
46
47
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Natasha. Oh,
```

Natasha is not available right now.

48

Rick, do you have any comments in regard to this proposal and the amendment.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Hearing none, call for question on the.....

MS. SKINNER: Oh, can I make a comment.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, thank you. I am in support of Pat's amendment. I do understand Coral's concern with adding more words with the result being something that's more wordy without added value. think that this amendment does add value because it keeps in the Federal public waters language which as I said before I think is important, but it also adds a more easily understood description of the area that's covered by the regulation. It is a description that as I said before I think most people who live in Kodiak would be able to intuitively figure out or understand what area were talking about whereas if you just said Federal public waters, that -- most people are going to have no idea where those are. So in that regard if the goal of this language is to make this regulation more easily understood and more accessible to the reader of the regulation I think this language does that.

All of that being said I do -- I'm not going to propose to do it today, but I think at some point I think we should go back and look at this language in general. If it's merely mimicking old State of Alaska sport regulations and the intent was to mirror that language and that language has now changed, it's probably worth it to go back in and be more clear for this regulation. But I think that's a task for a future meeting.

Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. Somebody may have their -- needs to mute their phone that's online.

47 MR. KOSO: You must be ready to go, 48 huh.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: We're getting close, Rick. I think your phone needs to be muted.

2 3 4

Coral.

5 6

MS. CHERNOFF: Yeah, I've just got a question for OSM. Has anyone.....

7 8 9

(Teleconference interference - participants not muted).

10 11 12

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$$ HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Richard or whoever's on the line could you please mute your phone, please.

14 15 16

13

Thank you.

17 18

19

20

21

2223

MS. CHERNOFF: So I'm going through the process of how I look at regulations. And so I am going to ask OSM has anyone looked at a map and saw where are the Federal public waters of Kodiak Island and then looked up what is the road accessible zone, northeastern Kodiak Island and looked the east of the line from Craig Point and do those all line up?

242526

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Scott.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45 46

47

48

MR. AYERS: Madame Chair. Thank you, member Chernoff. So what you're identifying and what the Council's been discussing here today is a relic of the way that our regulations were brought over at the beginning of this program. My understanding is that they started the program there was understanding that after there was a direction for Federal management of these programs that there was uncertainty as to how long that would last, that it was thought that the State would change their constitution to comply with ANILCA. And therefore when they began this whole process they were going to have to split the regulations and then they thought that they would be bringing them back together again. And so developing a whole second set of regulations was going to be complicated and cause that process of bringing them back together to be really difficult. So we've ended up with these regulations that across much of the State mirror exactly what was in the State regulations, oftentimes what was previously in the State regulations because those have changed and we have not necessarily had corresponding proposals to change the regulations.

Oftentimes that means that area descriptors are exactly the same as the State area descriptors and sometimes that's perfectly aligned with Federal public waters and other times there just aren't Federal public waters in a particular area, but we still use that area descriptor. This is the same thing we're going to encounter with the whole next set of closures which will be discussed later is that they were all brought over from State closures. And so we are just taking a first look at them now and saying are these still relevant or not.

This gets a little bit away from the question that you were asking and I think that member Holmes perhaps just showed you an image that may have helped clarify that.

MS. CHERNOFF: Well, thank you. I do see an image, I haven't read the descriptor of what it is yet. But what I'm asking is if I look up in the regulation book in the Federal public waters of Kodiak Island and I found that on a map and then if I looked up -- I don't even know how I would look up road accessible zone, northeastern Kodiak Island, if I look that up, put it on a map and then if I looked up whatever all that other stuff is and put it on a map and I overlaid them will they be the same area. So I guess I'm -- that's what I'm asking. I think it would be negligent to vote yes if those three maps don't line up.

MS. SKINNER: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, I guess I am now rethinking my perspective on this. So I understood Coral's question or I interpreted Coral's question the way I wanted to to ask if I said road accessible zone and then I took all of that language about east of the line from Craig Point south to the western most point of Saltery Cove, et cetera and I created a map image of would it look to me consistent with road that, accessible zone. And, I mean, I know that we have a map in the packet, but I see that that map is -- you know, it's from 2003 so it was produced for another purpose. I don't know if this is exactly the same -if it's based on the same descriptive language that is in the current regulation and it's definitely different

from the map that Pat brought over and handed to Coral. So at this point if road accessible zone is actually different than all of the descriptive words that are the artifact coming over from the State sport regs, if those are inconsistent then I agree with Coral that it's irresponsible to vote yes on this if those aren't the same. But if you guys have looked at it and determined that it is the same or you can point to an image or you can say the map that's in the packet is an accurate representation of all those words then that would address my question.

Thank you.

MR. AYERS: The description does not line up with Federal public lands or waters, it's merely drawing a line encompassing the road system on Kodiak Island. And we -- to draw a line or to describe a line, differentiating between State and Federal land in that area would be extremely difficult. Our regulations routinely encompass areas that have a mosaic of different land ownerships and it's implied that our regulations only apply on Federal public lands and waters. So many of our area descriptions don't in fact describe boundaries perfectly. I hope that makes sense.

Thank you.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}\xspace$. SKINNER: Yeah. So that was a very helpful response.

Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MADAME}}$$ CHAIR TRUMBLE: So basically we are ready to vote on an amendment.

Lisa. An amend -- just to maybe clarify what the amendment was.

 MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Okay. We're going to vote on an amendment to FP 23-05b made by Pat and seconded by Rebecca to -- leaving the first part of the sentence and then adding additional language on the road accessible zone. That's a general summarization. So we're going to vote on the amendment.

Pat Holmes.

```
0165
 1
                   MR. HOLMES: Yes.
 2
 3
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Richard
 4
   Koso.
 5
 6
                   MR. KOSO:
                               I'm going to abstain.
 7
   don't know where I'm at on this deal here. I'll let
 8
    the Kodiak people figure that one out so I'll abstain
 9
    from voting.
10
11
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
12
    Christopher Price.
13
14
                    MR. PRICE: Yes.
15
16
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Coral
17
   Chernoff.
18
19
                   MS. CHERNOFF: No.
20
21
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Rebecca
22
   Skinner.
23
24
                   MS. SKINNER: No.
25
26
                   MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Della
27
    Trumble.
28
29
                   MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: I have to admit
   I'm truly lost. I'm going to -- because I am confused
30
31
    a little bit and lost on this whole issue I'm going to
32
    have to say no. Yeah, I -- no.
33
34
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: And Natasha
35
    Hayden.
36
37
                    (No comments)
38
39
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: She left.
40
41
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Oh, that's
42
   right, she left. Okay. So we have three nays and one
43
    abstain and one yay so it fails, the amendment fails.
44
45
                    Okay. Now we're back to the main
46
    motion.
47
48
                    MS. WESSELS: For the record it was two
49
   yay and three nays and one abstain and one absent.
50
```

```
0166
 1
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Chris and Pat
 2
    voted yes.
 3
 4
                    MS. WESSELS: I just wanted to clarify
 5
   for the record what the vote was.
 6
 7
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.
 8
 9
                    MS. WESSELS: And the motion to amend
10
    failed.
11
12
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                           That's correct.
13
    Thank you.
                  Now we'll be on to the main motion to
14
    approve FP 23-05b. Roll call, please.
15
16
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                   Patrick
17
    Holmes.
18
19
                    MR. HOLMES: I think that I'll probably
20
    vote on this because it's going to be in the Federal
21
    reg book and so then one would naturally assume even
22
    though the amendment I was proposing, they would know
23
    that by knowing it's a Federal reg book so I'll say
24
    yes.
25
26
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: I couldn't
27
    hear what he was saying.
28
29
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, can you --
30
    you need to get closer to the mic and rephrase that,
31
    please.
32
33
                    MR. HOLMES: Okay. I'll get closer and
34
    talk louder. I would -- I'll be voting yes and I think
    that folks would be able to answer the question that
    we've been debating because it'll be in the Federal
36
37
    regulation book defining all sorts of Federal things
38
    and so being as my motion failed then I would be voting
39
    for this because I think it answers the question.
40
41
                    Thank you.
42
43
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                     Coral
44
    Chernoff.
45
46
                    MS. CHERNOFF: I will be voting no.
47
48
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                   Rebecca
49
    Skinner.
```

```
0167
 1
                    MS. SKINNER: No.
 2
 3
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                    Natasha
 4
    Hayden.
 5
 6
                     (No comments)
 7
 8
                    MS.
                          HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                      Della
 9
     Trumble.
10
11
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: No.
12
     for clarification I'm still not quite sure I understand
13
     what's being proposed here. So.....
14
15
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH: Christopher
16
     Price.
17
18
                    MR. PRICE:
                                  Yeah, I'll vote yes and
19
    I'll say why.
                      I like the amendment better though
20
    because I think what we were trying to get is a better
    description of the location. And I think the amendment
21
22
    tried to do that, but I can still support this because
23
    I think that's what people want, but again I'm not from
    Kodiak, but it appears to me that that's what they're
24
25
    looking for is a better way to describe the location.
26
     So that's what I support. So I would vote yes.
27
28
                    MS.
                          HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
                                                       And,
29
    Richard Koso.
30
31
                    MR. KOSO: I vote no.
32
                                                 Okay.
33
                    MS. HUTCHINSON-SCARBROUGH:
34
    was three yays and three nays so it failed, correct?
35
36
                    MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE:
                                             We are losing
37
    it,
        we can't even count.
                                  And I agree with what
38
     Rebecca's saying and I think the intention behind this
39
     is good sense, but what's documented is not matching
40
     these maps. So again the idea that you were not to be
41
    responsible to vote on something, it's going to be out
42
    there for god knows how many years and it would be
43
    better to not have somebody come back and say hey, you
44
    guys passed this and it does not make any sense, it
    doesn't match up and then you go back through the whole
45
46
    process. But like I agree with Chris that, you know,
47
    the idea behind this is good, but what's in front of us
48
    and almost like the last proposal, maybe just a little
```

more tweaking and work on it might not be a bad idea as

49

0168	a recommendation.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. HOLMES: That map that I found and passed down the table was on the State side so I don't know what map you're comparing the description to that doesn't match.
7 8 9 10	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: The map in the book.
11	MR. PRICE: Page 47.
12 13	MR. HOLMES: Thank you.
14 15 16	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay. Are we up to one more proposal.
17 18	MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.
19 20	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat.
21 22	MR. HOLMES: This Federal just marine
	waters, this does not include the definition that we were discussing at all.
26 27	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That was the point, Pat.
28 29	MR. HOLMES: Yeah. Okay.
30 31	(I aughtor)
32	(Laughter)
35 36	MR. HOLMES: Well, it says Women's Bay Federal jurisdiction, not necessarily Kodiak marine waters or marine waters of the road system. This is just a map of Women's Bay and the Buskin.
37 38 39 40 41	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That correct. And it was brought to our attention I think by Rebecca maybe that this map is from May, 2003.
42 43 44	MR. HOLMES: But the description is accurate.
45	MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Let's go ahead
46	and try one more proposal to go through before we call
47	it a day. So FCR 21-18, Afognak Bay Closure Review.
48 49	Jarred Stone.

MR. STONE: All right. Well, good evening. For the record my name is Jarred Stone, I'm a Fisheries Biologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. And I thought before we get started tonight on the closure reviews that I would first give a primer on the closure review process as well as give an overview of some of the outreach that OSM and some of the volunteers from the Council has helped us with. And then lastly give you a sense to OSM's conclusion for most of these closures reviews.

So as you know during the fall of even number years the Regional Advisory Councils review fishery closures. It is the Federal Subsistence Board's policy that Federal public lands and waters should be reopened as soon as reasonable once the conditions that originally justified a closure have changed to such an extent that it's no longer necessary. The purpose of these reviews are to determine if the closures are still warranted and to ensure that they do not remain in place any longer than necessary.

The Federal Subsistence Board will act on this set of fishery closure reviews during their January, 2023 regulatory meeting. There are a total of 14 closure reviews up for your consideration today, 13 of which involve.....

(Laughter)

MR. STONE: So again there are 14 closure reviews up for your consideration today, 13 of which involve areas closed to salmon fishing under Federal regulations. It's important to note a couple of things. Number 1, you or likely someone you know probably already fish in these waters or these locations under State sport regulations. However these same waters are closed to subsistence salmon fishing under Federal regulations. This situation is not in compliance with ANILCA title VIII, section 804 which mandates a rural preference for consumptive uses of fish and wildlife on Federal public lands and waters. For all closures involving salmon OSM is recommending to rescind the closure thereby providing for title VIII's rural priority. If the closures are rescinded the In-Season Manager can use their delegated authority from the Board to manage these fisheries in the short term. This can be done by writing in new stipulations

2

on the area permit or by implementing special actions to allow certain gear types, harvests or seasons. This approach is considered temporary until proposals are submitted to set up the framework for the fishery.

5

7

9

10

11

We do have two closures where a Council member has submitted fishery proposals to address these closures directly and that includes the Buskin River and Women's Bay. This is a prime example of what we hope to see in the next cycle where people craft proposals to specify the gear types, harvest limits and the seasons of these rescinded closures.

12 13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

So as you recall the Federal Subsistence Board deferred action on the seven closure reviews from this region from the 2020 cycle following this Council's recommendation to do so. direction of the Kodiak/Aleutian Regional Advisory Council OSM Staff and volunteers from the Council began reaching out to community, tribal and State Advisory Committee representatives to share information, to answer questions and to solicit input on the closure reviews. meeting was held Α with representatives from Kodiak Island on January 6th, 2021. Seven representatives were in attendance. tribal representatives expressed gratitude for the notice and withheld any comments or recommendations until they had more time to consider the closure reviews.

293031

32

OSM Staff then met with the Kodiak Fish and Game Advisory Committee on February 9th, 2021 to present fisheries closure reviews and to get feedback.

33 34 35

36

37

OSM Staff also attended the Dutch Harbor, Unalaska Fish and Game Advisory Committee meeting on February 22nd, however that meeting was cancelled due to the Committee not having a quorum.

42

43

44

45

More recently OSM Staff traveled to Kodiak and met with Council members, the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge Staff, community members of Ouzinkie, the Afognak Round Table which consists of the Afognak Native Corporation, the Native Village of Afognak and the Native Village of Port Lions as well as the Sun'aq Tribe and the Koniag Tribe.

46 47 48

Members of the Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional Advisory Council have volunteered

to assist OSM Staff in these outreach efforts and met numerous times over the last two years to help develop and outreach plan that would encourage local residents and stakeholders to consider providing comments regarding each of the closure reviews. Various outreach materials were crafted including shorter summaries that described the closures. We also drafted additional maps to clarify the areas of the closures. We drafted radio and newspaper advertisements as well as we added to our OSM webpage a way for people to view closure reviews and to view maps of these closures. And lastly we also created some community flyers that we shared with various communities in the Kodiak/Aleutians region.

So with that we would like to thank the volunteers from the Council, Refuge Staff and the tribes and others who have helped with this outreach plan. We feel confident today that the council has the information needed to make an informed decision regarding each of these closure reviews.

This concludes my overview of our outreach efforts and the Office of Subsistence Management's approach with these closures. Anyone wishing to make a comment on any of the closure reviews during the meeting can do so by providing oral comments during the public testimony portion of the Council's discussion on the issue or written comments to the Council prior to a discussion of the agenda item.

Are there any questions before I begin to present the first closure review analyses?

MS. SKINNER: Madame Skinner.

MS. SKINNER: Rebecca.

 MS. SKINNER: Thank you. I was hoping you could -- well, two things. One is to remind us what actions are available to us in regards to each closure and then if there is a desire to retain the status quo, so keep the closure, what kind of justification should we consider getting into the record for the Federal Subsistence Board so what will they be looking for that would justify maintaining a Federal subsistence closure in a particular area?

Thanks.

MR. STONE: Thank you. Through the Chair. Thank you for the question. The actions available, there are four. You can choose to maintain the status quo, you can choose to rescind the closure, the third option is to modify the closure and then lastly the last option is to defer the decision or take no action. They're sort of similar and one and the same.

As for the -- your second part of your question to justifications needed to maintain a status quo. When it is in regards to a resource that is of a conversation concern and you wish to not allow additional effort or additional harvest on a resource, that could be one justification for doing such. Does that answer your question?

MS. SKINNER: I think it does. So when

we....

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Rick, was that

24 you?

MR. KOSO: Madame Chair, this is Rick here. My phone died on me so I'm going to be cutting off here in a couple of minutes, okay?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Okay.

 MS. SKINNER: Thanks. So really what we're looking or what the Federal Subsistence Board would be looking at a reason to maintain a closure would be a conservation concern.

MR. STONE: Thank you. Through the Chair. Yes. And one note that I'll make is of these 14 closure reviews 13 of which apply to you as a Federally-qualified subsistence user, there is one closure review under consideration for the harvest of king crab. And I believe that's FCR 23-22. And so -- I lost my train of thought. Could you please rephrase that question.

MS. SKINNER: I think you were going to talk about conservation concern, that maybe the proposals don't have conservation concerns. I'm not sure where you were going with that.

MR. KOLLER: Madame Chair, this is Justin Koller, Fisheries Biologist with OSM. The conservation concern can certainly be used as a justification to maintain a closure. I think what Jarred was about to say is that 13 of these closures currently have State sport fisheries that are allowed to fish in these areas which is not in alignment with ANILCA. So straight using conservation concern to maintain these closures would prolong the situation we have which is just -- it's not in alignment with ANILCA.

Thank you.

MS. CHERNOFF: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Coral.

MS. CHERNOFF: And in the same line of questioning under modify, what are our choices there?

Thank you. MR. STONE: Through the Chair. That's a great question and we had kind of gone through this the last cycle. I had learned many lessons about what we can and cannot do in terms of modification. And during that process what we learned is that for the public to weigh in on any changes for the -- any of the closure reviews is outside of the scope to make modifications to things such as gear type or harvest or seasons. And so the options for modifications are somewhat limited I will say. If you bear with me. So basically the two options are to limit who can participate in the fishery and then also where the area descriptions or the areas. So examples of that would be to broaden the closure to both subsistence and nonsubsistence users.

MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat. Yeah, what if we felt it wasn't necessary at all?

MR. STONE: Thank you. Through the Chair and Pat. What do you mean by not necessary?

MR. HOLMES: Well, you say that the sport fish regulations I believe you meant weren't covered -- aren't provided for subsistence there. But I guess I don't understand what the advantage would be.

I understand -- I heard that you folks, the visiting team to Kodiak, mentioned that sometimes the State closes subsistence, but not rod and reel and that that's an advantage having rod an reel, did that happen because....

5 6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

MR. STONE: Thank you. Through the And I think what maybe you're hinting at is, Chair. you know, our -- we're mandated to try and provide it priority and you might be asking, you know, where is the priority. And, you know, during times of low returns such as we're experiencing now with coho salmon on the Buskin, when there's a closure it applies to everybody, nobody -- you know, nobody can fish. this closure were to be rescinded the Federal In-Season Manager then has the authority to exclude nonsubsistence uses such as rod and reel from sport fishing. And so there's an opportunity for Kodiak residents to provide food for their plates, but exclude nonrurals.

202122

23

24

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So it provides for a subsistence priority in the event there was a need or lack of resource for maybe a small harvest or something that the In-Season Manager would allow.

252627

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ HOLMES: What would the In-Season Manager base that on, you know, and -- yeah, that's the question.

293031

32

33

34

35

36

37

28

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Pat, I think I kind of just said it, maybe I need to be more clear and Jarred could -- they can make it based on how many fish have escaped base -- escapement, and if there is a small amount that can be harvested for subsistence purposes they have the authority to make that determination in consultation of course with the State and the tribal entities that are involved.

38 39 40

Is that correct?

41 42

43

44

45 46

47

48

MR. STONE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yes, that is correct. And to Pat's question, you know, how are these fisheries monitored, the Federal In-Season management would be -- I'm sorry, the Federal In-Season Manager would be paying close attention to the weir data coming from the Buskin River and other metrics too as well from Women's Bay. And so in most areas we're fortunate to have monitoring projects to

allow for that In-Season management information, but in some areas we don't. And for the Buskin and for the Women's Bay, you know, we have that information. This particular closure review again that we're going to be looking at here next will be pertaining to Afognak Bay. So I just want to bring your attention to FCR 21-18.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Jarred. And I don't know about everybody else, I -- if we've got questions on this process maybe we do that now and start in the morning on the -- on the next one. And just maybe as an example, Pat, using Unimak 10 in regard to the caribou, there is a limited harvest based on the Refuge Manager in this case on what could be harvested for purposes of subsistence. And that's just basically the same process and it's used up north also at this time.

Chris.

MR. PRICE: Okay. I understand what you guys are trying to do, but why are these other ones out of alignment, you're saying there's 13 that are not in alignment, is that.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: That's right.

MR. PRICE: And that's what we're trying to fix?

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Uh-huh.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ PRICE: And I'm just trying to understand why are they out of alignment? That's my question.

MR. STONE: Through the Chair. So I wouldn't say that they're out of alignment, what I would say is that these closure reviews have not been considered or reviewed for 20 plus years and we're now just bringing these to light and looking at them a little bit closer with a magnifying glass and what we're finding is that we're not in compliance with ANILCA section 804. We're supposed to provide a priority for consumptive uses and right now we're denying the opportunity for Federally-qualified to harvest fish, but that under State regulations there is harvest being done under sport fish regulations.

MR. HOLMES: I guess that point on there is that in this whole western region like I've said four times, when they close -- when something's short, commercial's closed, the subsistence is closed and the sport fish. And so I don't see how sport fish would be open if the -- these streams in Women's Bay came up short because they would be closed by everything else and is not gillnet also a Federallyqualified tool. And so just because you don't have rod and reel doesn't mean that you're not providing that opportunity. What I see in this is that it will cause quite a reallocation of things and it's just totally not necessary because that's just not way salmon is managed in the western region.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, Jarred, and then I might make a comment after that.

MR. STONE: Yeah. Thank you. And some of the flexibility afforded to the In-Season Managers to pick and choose what gear types and so in these systems that may be perhaps vulnerable to the use of gillnets or other means that we would hope that the In-Season Manager then would, you know, choose the correct gear types that are appropriate for that particular fishery. Again this is sort of a short term solution to what we hope to see future fisheries proposals come in that would set up the framework for the fishery and ultimate the local users, you know, tell us what kind of fishery they want to see.

MR. HOLMES: Well, I guess what is existing is what folks have wanted to have and it was in place before OSM and before all of this and when it came in that's what they liked and that's what, as far as I know, they still do. I did before you guys made your effort before every meeting I gave information to the tribes, to the Advisory Committees, I talked to people and I have yet to have anybody, my colleague, Rebecca and probably her sister, but I have -- no one has said that they would like to have that. And so your proceeding providing something that people haven't asked for, you're providing something that the Federal government thinks that we need. But frankly I just don't see it.

But thank you, I'm trying to.....

MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat.

Rebecca.

MS. SKINNER: Yeah, thank you. So I'll make a comment and then Jarred can correct or amplify. So the reason that we as a RAC are doing these closure reviews is because the Federal Subsistence Board has to do these closure reviews and so they've given us our homework which is from a regional level we need to give them input. My opinion is they're going to do these closure reviews. We've already kicked the can down the road for two cycles, I don't know how many more times that the Federal Subsistence Board will go along with So at some point the Federal Subsistence Board that. is going to make a decision on these closure reviews. So this is our opportunity to have a say and give them advice and input. And so that's my first comment. Well, it was two parts, one, we're doing this because the Federal Subsistence Board told us we have to because they have to and two, this is our opportunity to give input to them and reenforce the Federal subsistence priority.

And then my third comment is just to remind everyone to distinguish between these closures that are in regulation that we're reviewing versus the In-Season management process. Because In-Season management will continue, that's something that is still a tool that's available, but that's very distinct from whether these closures exist in regulation. Because right now what we have in our packet clearly shows that there's areas where State sport fishing is possible and available and Federal subsistence is not. And.....

MR. HOLMES: No, that's not.....

MS. SKINNER:to me that's problematic. And I think that's what we're being told is that there's a priority requirement in ANILCA that's not being met. And that's why we're doing this process.

So that was my comment and you can correct or amplify. Thanks.

47 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Go ahead, 48 Jarred.

0178 1 MR. STONE: Thank you. Through the Chair. I have really nothing to add, that was spot on. 4 Thank you, Ms. Skinner. 5 6 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you. 7 Rebecca, that is perfect because we've kicked this can down the road for two years. When I come back to the meeting in January and we say we put this off again 9 10 then we have not done our job. And part of us doing 11 this was trying to get the public involved and that in 12 itself was an effort, I mean, but we do have to 13 remember why we sit here. We have to remember that we 14 represent sometimes different sport users, hunters, 15 commercial fishermen, subsistence users and different organizations and agencies, but we need to be able to 16 17 sit here and do our job and not say no, this is this 18 and no, this is that. We need to sit down and address 19 this, that is what we have to do. And god help me, 20 it's probably going to take us until tomorrow night at 21 midnight at the rate we're going. 22 23 (Laughter) 24 25 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: So with that 26 recommendation I'd say we convene until tomorrow 27 morning at 8:30. Think about his tonight, Pat. 28 29 (Laughter) 30 31 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Jarred. 32 33 MR. STONE: If I may I just would add that I'm available tonight if anyone has questions, you 34 want to go over a particular scenario or a particular 36 thing I'm more than willing to help. So I'm here. 37 38 MADAME CHAIR TRUMBLE: Thank you much. 39 Time to take a Thank you. Tough work today, guys. 40 break. 41 42 (Off record) 43 44 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED) 45 46 47

0179	
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
4)ss.
5	STATE OF ALASKA)
6 7	T Colone & Hile Materia Dublic in and for the
8	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
9	Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
10	Reporters, and, do hereby certify.
11	THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through
12	contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
13	KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
14	COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I electronically on the 21st
15	day of September 2022;
16	
17	THAT the transcript is a true and
18	correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
19 20	thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
21	ability;
22	ability,
23	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
24	party interested in any way in this action.
25	
26	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th
27	day of October 2022.
28	
29	
30 31	Salena A. Hile
32	Notary Public, State of Alaska
33	My Commission Expires: 09/16/26
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41 42	
42	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	